



## Appendix E1 – Combined Representation Responses to Section One Publication Draft Local Plan

OCTOBER 2017

CBC rep ID	BDC rep ID	TDC rep ID	Name, Organisation		Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/ written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan
				Legally compliant										
<b>Introduction</b>														
6019			Alexander Riley				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			We need to involve other neighbouring authorities, such as Ipswich and Suffolk Coastal, on strategic cross border issues. Working across functional economic areas is positive, but infrastructure improvements must be a central concern for Colchester and our neighbouring local authorities. We could lobby a weakened government for devolved funding. Need to implement strategies to attract high value, innovative businesses from London and Cambridge to Colchester - the danger of not doing this and simply focussing on housing is that we become a dormitory town.	
6156			The University of Essex (The JTS Partnership)				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			The University of Essex welcomes the collaborative approach being taken by Colchester, Tendring and Braintree Councils towards the delivery of major infrastructure, housing and employment allocations across the North Essex area.	
6555			Colin Tuckwell	yes	no	no	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	w	yes	The inherent ambition and opportunity within the plans is not nearly matched by the quality of strategic development thinking or understanding of delivery of such programmes. Essential in any programme like this is a clear definition of goals, priorities, dependencies, constraints and structures defining delivery approach and responsibilities. All are absent; delivery has ONE PAGE? Economic development thought is impoverished. The programme's scale would be of interest to people of world class skill, experience and investment credentials. Our communities should demand no less. Current thinking and advisers appear grossly limited for leading/facilitating a programme of this importance and opportunity scale.	Please see attached document of August 2016 & comments above.
6725			Marks Tey Parish Council (PJPC Ltd)					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			The strategic approach regarding the Garden Communities is supported and visionary / forward looking, However as they are extremely ambitious and potentially costly their viability must be proven. There should be clear indications that they will support and enhance existing communities through full collaboration and that they will provide fully sustainable settlements at each stage of development. Clear parameters / principles must be enshrined within the plan to guide development now and in the future to avoid uncertainty,	
6802			Dedham Parish Council (Emma Cansdale)				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			Dedham Parish Council feel the Local Plan is Legally Compliant, they have complied with their duty to Co-operate, and the plan is Sound. In respect to the issues we raised regarding downsizing, Dedham Parish Council's views (as submitted at the last consultation) have been represented in the Settlement Boundary Review (updated June 2017) as part of the New Local Plan Evidence Base.	
7285			Bloor Homes (Strutt & Parker)	no	no	no	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	h	yes	Rep to the SA. The NPPF requires decisions to be justified and based on proportionate evidence (p.182) the SA/SEA does not consider an alternative to the currently drafted SG8. As such, it is necessary for the SA/SEA to consider an alternative scenario for SG* which considers housing delivery through neighbourhood plans as a minimum and not for the proposed dwelling numbers to be treated as a ceiling.	
	1		Mr James	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		You can't be doing you job if you advocate West of Braintree without even considering Wethersfield Airbase.	
	23		Mr Howard Phillips	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Meetings have not been sufficient in respect of AECOM meetings in the early stages. Publicity for the meeting held at Braintree Town hall in respect of the plan was not even publicised outside of the venue until raised by myself when a small A4 sign was attached to the main door! Hardly the free and welcoming consultation that should be expected.	

	42	Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Failure to meet NPPF 155 . I cannot answer the question below whether I raised this before because I cant remember the answer is probably!	
	104	Mrs Susan Baugh	yes	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No		NPPF PARA 155 NON COMPLIANT. IGNORING LOCAL RESIDENTS, INCLUDING THE VIEWS OF PARISH COUNCILS.	
	116	Mr Kevin Fraser Principal Planner, Spatial Planning Team Essex County Council Spatial Planning	yes	yes	yes	✓	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	No			
	128	Mr Nicholas Carey	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		it is not sound under NPPF para 182. It will be ineffective as there is no sound infrastructure delivery. Sections 1.13, 1.27, 1.28 and 1.31 have not been met. it is also not consistent with the policy of the NPPF. it is not meeting policy SP 6, "place shaping principles" which states that all new deve should respond positively to local charac and context to preserve and enhance the quality of existing communities and their environs. is is also not meeting policy SP 7 which states "each new garden community will confirm to the following principles..." Subsections IV, VI, VII and IX have not been met.	The local authority must adhere to the NPPF guidelines as clearly laid down.
	134	Mrs S Osborne	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	✓	No		does not apply with paragraph 155. ...meaningful engagement due to lack of detail. Especially with respect to west Tey. No meetings organised for local residents with developers. Doesn't comply with paragraph 10 of NPPF. Does not take in to context the constraints of historical infrastructure essentially single laned in places of coggeshall, kelvedon villages. Just because our villages lie next to the A12 and A120 it doesn't mean the roads can cope with excess development and increase in local traffic from west Tey, 1000 homes in Feering and several hundred homes in both Kelvedon and coggeshall. Neighbouring Colchester borough has grown & the local infrastructure and health provision has not kept up with pace. Gridlocked traffic around Tollgate & access roads in to Colchester. A12 and A120 at capacity with limited extra capacity even with planned improvements. There is a significant air pollution in both Bdc &cbc Does not comply with paragraph73 ....visual impact on the Essex Way.	To provide an actual map of West Tey would be a good start....but I do not feel West Tey will ever be a sound plan. They are stating it will be a self reliant garden city but all the evidence seen so far is it will become a dormitory town putting an increased strain on the local infrastructure. Where is the job provision? How will adding such significant and well above the required housing numbers be truly justified. Neighbouring colchester borough council need to respond first to it's infrastructure issues as they have consistently delivered higher numbers than the rest of the country. This level can not be sustained and for this reason I would propose a slow down and an exception is made for this area. Sort out the issues we are facing , once it has proved it is up to the present challenge and the issues the town faces then readdress the national housing problems. In the meantime concentrate on mainly affordable and social housing for it's current residents rather than trying to attract people in to the area. They have lost sight of the real issues this town is facing already due to overdevelopment Both Colchester borough council and Braintree district council failing to comply with national and local air pollution targets and legal policies set out by the clean air act. This causes a genuine risk of morbidity and mortality to it's present residents .West Tey will further increase these problems.General risk to health with overstretched health care provision. GP recruitment crisis. I work as a GP and have recorded wait times for ambulances going up in the last 4 years. I have asked for a patient to be picked up within the hour from the home due to requiring urgent hospital assessment. unless it is a blue light ( immediate risk to life ) I was advised the wait would be 7 hours. This is not safe practice. We are forced to take increasing medical risk with our patients due to shortages of ambulances in the

																		area and wait times in the local a&e departments and bed crisis in our hospitals. Colchester hospital has already been put in special measures due to standard of care concerns. This is largely due to bed and staff shortages . If we increase the population at the rate advised in the local plan our residents life will be put more at risk due to lack of emergency , hospital and community health provision.
	143		Mrs Rosie Pearson Secretary CAUSE	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		CAUSE will submit a representation for Section 1 via Colchester Borough Council. We will address each element of the Plan.	CAUSE will address the many changes required to make the Plan sound/legally compliant in our full representation which will be submitted via Colchester Borough Council.				
	161		Mrs Jacqueline Kingdom	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		No demonstrated duty to co-operate with neighbouring council					
	218		Mrs Geraldine Simmons Clerk Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting	Yes	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		Para 1.5 - Misleading comment. Failure to plan strategically	Reconsult with all neighbouring authorities with a view to agreeing strategic priorities in accordance with Para 156 of the NPPF and more particularly a joined up approach to balance housing growth with upfront delivery of urgently needed improvements to infrastructure, water supplies, telecoms, adequate health facilities and mitigation of environmental and other impacts including landscape on local communities affected by any resulting development proposals				
	266		Mr Edward Gittins Chartered Town Planner Edward Gittins & Associates Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered		We believe the Duty to Co-operate has not been adequately achieved in relation to Chelmsford and Uttlesford and that other elements of the Plan " such as the Settlement Hierarchy and Glossaries " have not been standardised to the same extent as the strategic policies.	Provide more information about the relationship on the proposals for how strategic issues and policies are co-ordinated with the neighbouring Districts of Uttlesford and Chelmsford in particular.				

	552	St Edmundsbury Borough Council	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		We have no comments on Section 1 " the joint strategic plan with Tendring District and Colchester Borough Councils.	
	577	Ms Sarah Nicholas Senior Planning Officer Uttlesford District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		General Comments and Summary 1.15 UDC Response: Uttlesford District Council and Braintree District Council have a strong working relationship bringing forward local plans for each authority area in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate requirements. Uttlesford District Council will continue to work closely with Braintree District Council on cross boundary local planning issues and the finalisation of a Joint Memorandum of Understanding between the two authorities.	
	639	Dr Natalie Gates Principal Advisor, Historic Places Team Historic England	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered			O/S No reference to distinctive character of Essex, no reference to protecting heritage assets. Historic England request that the Strategic Objectives be amended to include a requirement for new development to have regard to the historic environment, to reflect paragraph 7 of the NPPF (the three dimensions to sustainable development).
	658	Mr and Mrs Christopher and Hazel Healey	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered		We fully endorse the current version that is to be submitted for the Braintree area local plan. Nobody likes building sites, particularly in their area but this plan is the most sensible use of available land within the boundaries of the local roads in Braintree and the new suggested "garden villages" could also enhance the area and at the same time help to fulfil the need for more housing.	
	11	Mr Stephen Archer	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		1.28 You cannot have a plan for housing without a plan for roads & other transport to serve current & future needs. This does not do this	a proper plan for roads to serve new houses & existing. I don't know about legality & am frustrated that I have to opt yes/no above!!!!
	163	Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Infrastructure and Cluster economics	
	556	Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	Delete words wherever possible. Delete word some. Add at the end add!,but not so as to compromise the principles of sustainable development. Vision for NE Essex After the word designed add..low energy demanding and renewable energy heated!. homes etc Delete!.and space for sustainable drainage solutions. 1.31 para 4 second sentence, second clause to read!, to ensure that it is secured and delivered!. Etc
	664	John and Susan Warrant	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered		1.29 The NPPF expects local authorities to set out the strategic priorities for the area in the Local Plan. Of those listed in the Framework and based on the above key issues, this strategic plan chapter addresses: the homes and jobs needed in the area the provision of infrastructure for transport and telecommunications the provision of education, health, and community infrastructure, and conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, Including landscape	

	4	Haines	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	The Spatial is too superficial. In particular, scoping fails to consider the following aspects: Availability and location of Health services. These are a significant aspect of well-being for the population. The majority of the Braintree DC (BDC) population fall within the Mid Essex Health trust - which has the majority of its delivery capabilities outside of BDC. Having a local plan that commits to population growth without having a leverage on improving local health care provision is not effective. The spatial scope fails to consider the population demographics of the area in particular a failure to difference between: (1) levels of income in-equality across the region (2) the proportions of the population that are of working age and those that are retired. There is a token, generic reference to these in Key Issues, Opportunities and Challenges, but a more detailed, fact based analysis should be provided.	
	44	Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Falling down on Garden Communities Principles	
	117	Mr Kevin Fraser Principal Planner, Spatial Planning Team Essex County Council Spatial Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Change required for clarification. The key generator of freight on the GEML is the Port of Felixstowe although Harwich contributes to this demand. ECC recommends an amendment to paragraph 1.18 as follows: The Great Eastern Main Line provides rail services between London Liverpool Street and the East of England, including Witham, Chelmsford, Colchester and Clacton-on-Sea. It also carries freight traffic to and from the Haven Ports including Harwich International Port, which handles container ships and freight transport to and from the rest of the UK. Harwich is also one of the major UK ports for ferry and cruise departures.	
	6	Haines	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	The Objectives have no quantitative targets or timescales. The plan can only be Effective if it has measurable, trackable outcomes. "Fostering Economic Development" is a process, not an Objective. Similarly "Addressing" and "Ensuring" are meaningless platitudes.	
	12	Mr Stephen Archer	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	1.31 You cannot have a plan for housing without a plan for roads & other transport to serve current & future needs. This does not do this	
	46	Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Not SMART objectives	
	51	Sport England Sport England Planning Manager Eastern Region Sport England	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	In the context of the vision for North Essex including reference to providing leisure and recreation opportunities, the importance attached in Government planning policy (paragraph 69 of the NPPF) to promoting healthy communities and the corporate health and well-being priorities of the three local authorities it is surprising that there is not a strategic objective that specifically covers creating healthier and active communities. While one of the objectives covers addressing healthcare needs, this only represents part of what is required to create healthier communities. In particular, providing opportunities for people to be physically active through leisure and recreation opportunities will be an essential requirement to help encourage healthier lifestyles	To ensure that the plan is sound in terms of meeting the justified and consistent with national policy tests It is therefore requested that an additional strategic objective is added to those listed in paragraph 1.31 (or the Addressing Education and Healthcare Needs objective is extended) which focuses on creating healthier communities through providing opportunities for physical activity in development by designing development to provide opportunities for healthy and active lifestyles, meeting leisure and recreation facilities needs (as well as providing for conventional health care needs) .
	72	Mr Christopher Bailey Owner Agent: Mr Christopher Bailey Clockhouse Town Planning	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	This section makes a number of false statements. As such it is not justified. Being a core part of the plan it renders the plan ineffective and not positively prepared	Redraft this section to reflect the reality and not present an unrealistic situation from whence the plan is not sound.
	559	Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	1.31 para 4 second sentence, second clause to read!, to ensure that it is secured and delivered!. Etc
	43	Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Not Compliant with NPPF Paragraph 155	

	73	Mr Christopher Bailey Owner Agent: Mr Christopher Bailey Clockhouse Town Planning	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		That the Inspector rejects the entire Plan as demonstrably unsustainable and instructs the LPA top start over again using a different approach that acknowledges our community is not a centrally planned command economy but is a market democracy.
	105	Mrs Susan Baugh	Yes	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No		LACK OF STRATEGIC COOPERATION BETWEEN BDC AND UDC ON WoB DEMONSTRATE A FAILURE TO ADOPT A STRATEGIC APPROACH.
	136	Mrs S Osborne	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	✓	No		I feel west Tey is a complete antithesis of Nppf 17 . The sprawl,of west Tey will not take in to account the different roles and character of the different areas.It does not protect our green belt as unfortunately we have none round Colchester and Chelmsford . We are reliant on you as a planning inspector to recognise that a "green belt " of land is paramount between these different towns and settlements. By agreeing to West Tey there will be a lack of definition between settlements and loss of rural identity between settlements .They will not conserve heritage assets for future generations The over optimistic and vague with unrealistic financial contingency planning and lack of cohesiveness in their present individual council policies make it incredibly difficult for these two councils to make a success of this project. paragraph 22 lack of planning for employment site and no advantage of a enterprise zone to attract business.Earlier Haven gateway failed bid.
	205	Mr Peter Williams Director Williams Group Agent: Mrs Teresa Cook Principal Consultant Emery Planning Partnership Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The representations are made on the overall strategy for Braintree as well as a wide range of specific policies and in the context of our clients interests at Braintree Retail Park and land to the south-east of Braintree. The Williams Group considers that the underlying spatial strategy of the plan is misconceived " essentially giving insufficient priority to the growth of the town of Braintree and placing too much reliance upon new garden communities. The plan is unsound without the inclusion of a mixed use development at an intrinsically sustainable location to the south east of Braintree town.
	219	Mrs Geraldine Simmons Clerk Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting	Yes	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		Reconsult with all neighbouring Authorities, Essex County Council and the Highway Authority with a view to agreeing strategic priorities in accordance with Para 156 of the NPPF and more particularly a joined up approach to balance housing growth with upfront delivery of urgently needed improvements to infrastructure, water supplies, telecoms, adequate health and education facilities and mitigation of environmental and other impacts including landscape on local communities affected by any resulting development proposals.
	582	Mr Jeremy Potter Planning & Strategic Housing Policy Manager Chelmsford City Council	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered		The Council welcomes the commitment made in Section 1 to working closely with all transport bodies, including on Essex County Councils route-based strategy for the A131 " Chelmsford to Braintree, and the Great Eastern Main Line. The Council looks forward to reviewing the Strategic Growth Development Plan Documents for each Garden Community which will be prepared following adoption of the three Plans, and the accompanying Infrastructure Development Programme to provide detail on phasing and costing of infrastructure requirements, including transport. Officers are satisfied overall that the shared Section 1 of the three plans provides a coherent strategy for the future growth of the three areas and seeks to meet the identified objectively assessed development needs.

	663	John and Susan Warrant	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered	1.11 The Localism Act 2011 places a Duty to Co-operate on local planning authorities and other public bodies BDC needs to read and understand fully that The Localism Act does not stop at public bodies: The Localism Act includes: new freedoms and flexibilities for local government; new rights and powers for communities and individuals ; reform to make the planning system more democratic and more effective, and reform to ensure that decisions about housing are taken locally. Therefore BDC needs to state that where local communities have met/exceeded any reasonable requirement they will support them in fighting unwanted further development.
--	-----	------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------	---

**LPA Response:** Includes a range of general comments that are covered by other representations under each Policy.

## Vision

CBC rep ID	BDC rep ID	TDC rep ID	Name, Organisation		Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/ written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan
				Legally compliant										
6020			Alexander Riley				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			Large scale infrastructure should pre-empt large scale developments. There must be total adherence to the sustainable development principles expressed within the Vision for North Essex. These Garden Communities should've been developed from the ground up, was an opportunity to pilot true neighbourhood planning. Economic development and infrastructure improvement should be the initial priorities within the strategic objectives, these will facilitate the other objectives - especially housing growth.	
6157			The University of Essex (The JTS Partnership)				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			The University supports the Strategic Objectives and, in particular, the acknowledgement (para 1.31) that there is a current deficit in transport infrastructure and that further investment, and provision, is needed to support new development with proposals being delivered in a phased and timely manner.	None
6269			Marks Tey Church				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			The Vision for Garden Communities is good in theory; but on past performance the local population do not trust CBC to deliver this. Community assets have not been delivered (at Myland and Tollgate), and Transport & Communication Infrastructure (A12, A120, and railway) have been delayed.	None
6438			Andrew Martin Planning (representing R F West)				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			The vision for the Strategic Area is fully supported, but we have reservations about the likely effectiveness of the proposed 'new approaches to delivery'. Further detail of our concerns and reasons are set out in our response to Policy SP7 in respect of our proposals for Land at East Marks Tey.	
6788			Marks Tey Parish Council (PJPC Ltd)	yes	no	yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			The vision should include reference to the need to have regard to appropriate integration or relation with existing communities in full collaboration with those communities.	Refer to the need to have regard to integration / relation with existing adjoining communities
6810			Maree Moore	yes	no	yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	w		The infrastructure (ie.water, drainage, internet ) of Abberton and Langenhoe cannot cope now , so will grind to a halt with extra building in the area. Facilities such as Drs., School, are already struggling to manage due to high numbers. The traffic will increase dramatically as we have no village shop, dentist, pub which means villagers have to travel to other villages/towns. we who choose to live in the countryside do so to enjoy the wildlife and green spaces, so we do not want to see every inch built on.	Build somewhere else or reduce the numbers of properties.
6865			Martin Robeson			no	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	h		Reservations - whilst there may be constraints, these are not so significant as to frustrate the greater proportion of future development needs that districts face, Colchester in particular. Vision needs to better articulate the manner by which existing urban areas will meet challenges going forward. Vision also fails to address need to have secured economic success across the District particularly in light of strategic objectives explaining need to foster economic development.	The Vision needs to better articulate the manner by which the existing urban areas will meet the challenges going forward. Such a challenge is recognised in respect of the garden communities, but that and the challenge for the existing urban areas could be better articulated as part of the Vision.



6888			Natural England			no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Section 1 plan needs to have a high level strategic objective and specific overarching policy on the need to protect and enhance the natural environment.	In particular, the Vision needs to reflect the particular challenges and issues for delivery wherever development is to be located.
6935			Historic England			no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Officer summary -Disappointing that there remains no reference in para 1.31 to require development to respond to distinctive character of North Essex. No reference to protecting heritage assets and the character of existing settlements. Historic England's comments on June 2016 Draft Plan suggested that the Strategic Objectives could require "developments to respond to the distinctive character of North Essex as part of providing sufficient new homes and ensuring high quality outcomes."	Historic England request that Strategic Objectives be amended to include a requirement for new development to have regard to historic environment, to reflect paragraph 7 of the NPPF
7052			Boyer Planning (representing Andrew Mattin re Livelands)			yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	yes	We support the vision where it sets out Colchester will build on its progress to regenerate further brownfield sites where they before available.	
7106			Mark Tonge				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The plan does not have a real vision. The plan is tactical rather than strategic. Where is the economic generator for East Anglia akin to a 3rd runway at Heathrow or HS2 etc. Significant infrastructure development should be a key ingredient of any local plan to make it both viable and sustainable long term to create prosperous new communities that can thrive and succeed rather than create communities that would have a higher risk of dependencies on the public purse. The plan has no economic case and there is a big difference between having a genuine economic generator and economic activity that will simply derive from the local plan.	None
7141			Sport England			no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		In the context of the vision for North Essex providing leisure and recreation opportunities, the importance attached in Government planning policy (paragraph 69 of the NPPF) to promoting healthy communities and the corporate health and well-being priorities of the three local authorities it is surprising that there is not a strategic objective that specifically covers creating healthier and active communities. The objective that covers addressing healthcare needs, only represents part of what is required to create healthier communities. Providing opportunities for people to be physically active through leisure and recreation opportunities will be essential requirement to encourage healthier lifestyles.	To ensure that the plan is sound in terms of meeting the 'justified' and consistent with national policy' tests It is therefore requested than an additional strategic objective is added to those listed in paragraph 1.31 (or the 'Addressing Education and Healthcare Needs' objective is extended) which focuses on creating healthier communities through providing opportunities for physical activity in development by designing development to provide opportunities for healthy and active lifestyles, meeting leisure and recreation facilities needs (as well as providing for conventional health care needs) .
	5		Haines	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	The Positively Prepared condition is failed if people cannot understand what is being proposed. As examples: The use of terms such as "blue infrastructure " are unclear as to their meaning. The term "garden communities" has inherent marketing bias.	
	45		Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Failure to acknowledge where growth and investment is really needed with in Essex	
	151		Henry Price	No	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The 'vision for standalone developments' is not justified in the LP and BDC has not shown adequately how it can be effective. Braintree is a failing town, pulled Eastwards by out of town shopping, and does not have the critical mass to sustain thriving retail/leisure at its centre. The obvious alternative to WoB, of focusing new housing on Braintree, has not been fully examined and fails to follow national policy on brownfield sites.	- Alternatives to WoB need to be fully examined as the draft LP fails to justify this policy otherwise. - Justification needs to be given for building on prime agricultural land. This directly contradicts the LP objective of protecting and enhancing count

	206		Mr Peter Williams Director Williams Group Agent: Mrs Teresa Cook Principal Consultant Emery Planning Partnership Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	□	Yes		The vision for North East Essex as currently drafted raises concerns over the focus of the strategy for the development of Braintree district in the coming 20-year period. Despite most of the new housing and other built development over this period in Braintree district being planned for delivery within or alongside the existing settlements, the emphasis of the strategic vision is tilted overwhelmingly towards the progression of the new garden communities.	The Vision should include a statement placing the existing settlements and their capacity to accommodate sustainable change at the heart of the strategic vision for North Essex. Braintree (and Colchester) should be identified as the highest order settlements. The term blue infrastructure should be included in the glossary or explained elsewhere in the plan text.
	220		Mrs Geraldine Simmons Clerk Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting	Yes	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes	4634126	Para 1.30 - Proper interpretation of NPPF principles. Meaning of	
	240		Mr Bill Newman Corporate Manager - Strategic Planning Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes	□	□	□	□	No		Paragraph 1.3 refers to Braintree sharing a border with both Babergh and Mid Suffolk. Whilst this is not considered to be an issue which goes to the soundness of the Plan, in fact only Babergh District shares a border with Braintree and reference to Mid Suffolk should therefore be removed.	Reference to Mid Suffolk should be removed from paragraph 1.3.
	558		Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No	□	✓	✓	✓	Yes		The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	After the word designed add..low energy demanding and renewable energy heated!. homes etc Delete!.and space for sustainable drainage solutions.
		LPPD13	Mrs Emma Goodings, Planning Policy Manager Braintree District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes	□	□	□	□			Section 1 of the Local Plan has been constructed in close co-operation with Braintree District Council (BDC) and is supported. BDC are satisfied that Tendring has addressed strategic issues, including the requirement to meet objectively assessed housing need.	None.
		LPPD19	Mr Andrew Hunter, Planning Advisor - Sustainable Places Team Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No	✓	□	□	□			Vision for North Essex We are supportive of the thrust of the Vision for North Essex. We are happy with the inclusion, in Objective 4, of references to ensuring that flood defence infrastructure and foul sewage infrastructure are considered by developers of future developments. The words in Objective 9 are good, but we currently have a problem with the Strategic Flood Risk Assessments' methodology for assessing the zonal extents of flood risk areas as a consequence of climate change as a means to support this objective.	None.
		LPPD30	Historic England	Yes	Yes	No	□	□	□	□			[Officer summary] It is disappointing that there remains no reference, in the strategic objectives to require development to respond to the distinctive character of North Essex and that there is no reference to protecting heritage assets and the character of existing settlements.	Include a requirement for new development to have regard to the historic environment, to reflect paragraph 7 of the NPPF (the three dimensions to sustainable development).
		LPPD34	Historic Environment Planning Adviser, Historic England	Yes	Yes	No	✓	□	✓	□			[Officer summary] There is no specific consideration for the historic environment within these principles. It is essential that the local plan should contain a framework to guide how the boundaries and extent of the garden communities are determined in the subsequent development plan documents. Historic Impact Assessments should be undertaken for each of the proposed broad locations.	Appropriate criteria for the protection of heritage assets and their settings need to be included in each of the policies and supporting text for the Garden Communities.

		LPPD49	Miss Jane Mower, Estates Programme Manager NHS England and NEECCG and NHSPS	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		"Broadband" please ensure that consideration is given to the technology agenda for the transformation of clinical services in the NHS. It is essential that Broadband infrastructure and connectivity is of a high speed and reliable in order to ensure that providing Primary Care at scale is achievable. The CCG would welcome inclusion in any discussions necessary with providers of broadband and telecommunications infrastructure.	None.
		LPPD52	Tetlow King, Tetlow King Planning	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		[Officer summary] The Strategic Objective for providing sufficient new homes needs to take account of future aspirations, in particular the desire to own a home in the future.	We recommend the following amendment: "Providing Sufficient New Homes" to provide for a level and quality of new homes to meet the needs and aspirations of a growing and ageing population in North Essex.
		LPPD93	Martin Robeson, Martin Robeson Planning Practice	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		[Officer summary] The Vision needs to better articulate the manner by which the existing urban areas will meet their challenges going forward. The Vision also fails to address the needs to have secured economic success across the District particularly in light of the strategic objective to "foster economic development" which is defined as including the need to "strengthen and diversify local economies...".	[Officer interpretation] Amend the vision for the Strategic Area to explain how urban areas will meet their challenges and foster economic development.

**LPA Response:** A range of opinions were expressed on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the vision and objectives for Section 1, including criticisms of the Garden Communities options, doubts over the delivery of supporting infrastructure, and concerns over the future for urban areas. Given the extent of joint work by the three authorities reflected on the overall vision for the Plan, the vision is considered to provide a comprehensive and cohesive forward plan for the area, including the innovative proposals for Garden Communities as the most sustainable approach to growth. The Councils will continue to work with stakeholders developing Statements of Common Ground and agreeing Minor Modifications as required. Council works with Suffolk authority on strategic cross border issues as required, with the Haven Gateway Partnership providing an important co-ordinating role for cross Suffolk-Essex border work. Aside from any minor modifications that may be required, no other changes are considered necessary to the introduction and vision elements of Section 1.

CBC rep ID	BDC rep ID	TDC rep ID	Name, Organisation	Legally compliant	Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/ written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan
							<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
<b>Introduction</b>														
6019			Alexander Riley				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			We need to involve other neighbouring authorities, such as Ipswich and Suffolk Coastal, on strategic cross border issues. Working across functional economic areas is positive, but infrastructure improvements must be a central concern for Colchester and our neighbouring local authorities. We could lobby a weakened government for devolved funding. Need to implement strategies to attract high value, innovative businesses from London and Cambridge to Colchester - the danger of not doing this and simply focussing on housing is that we become a dormitory town.	
6156			The University of Essex (The JTS Partnership)				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			The University of Essex welcomes the collaborative approach being taken by Colchester, Tendring and Braintree Councils towards the delivery of major infrastructure, housing and employment allocations across the North Essex area.	
6555			Colin Tuckwell	yes	no	no	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	w	yes	The inherent ambition and opportunity within the plans is not nearly matched by the quality of strategic development thinking or understanding of delivery of such programmes. Essential in any programme like this is a clear definition of goals, priorities, dependencies, constraints and structures defining delivery approach and responsibilities. All are absent; delivery has ONE PAGE? Economic development thought is impoverished. The programme's scale would be of interest to people of world class skill, experience and investment credentials. Our communities should demand no less. Current thinking and advisers appear	Please see attached document of August 2016 & comments above.

														grossly limited for leading/facilitating a programme of this importance and opportunity scale.	
6725			Marks Tey Parish Council (PJPC Ltd)					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				The strategic approach regarding the Garden Communities is supported and visionary / forward looking, However as they are extremely ambitious and potentially costly their viability must be proven. There should be clear indications that they will support and enhance existing communities through full collaboration and that they will provide fully sustainable settlements at each stage of development. Clear parameters / principles must be enshrined within the plan to guide development now and in the future to avoid uncertainty,	
6802			Dedham Parish Council (Emma Cansdale)					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			Dedham Parish Council feel the Local Plan is Legally Compliant, they have complied with their duty to Co-operate, and the plan is Sound. In respect to the issues we raised regarding downsizing, Dedham Parish Council's views (as submitted at the last consultation) have been represented in the Settlement Boundary Review (updated June 2017) as part of the New Local Plan Evidence Base.	
7285			Bloor Homes (Strutt & Parker)	no	no	no	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	h	yes	Rep to the SA. The NPPF requires decisions to be justified and based on proportionate evidence (p.182) the SA/SEA does not consider an alternative to the currently drafted SG8. As such, it is necessary for the SA/SEA to consider an alternative scenario for SG* which considers housing delivery through neighbourhood plans as a minimum and not for the proposed dwelling numbers to be treated as a ceiling.		
	1		Mr James	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		You can't be doing your job if you advocate West of Braintree without even considering Wethersfield Airbase.		
	23		Mr Howard Phillips	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Meetings have not been sufficient in respect of AECOM meetings in the early stages. Publicity for the meeting held at Braintree Town hall in respect of the plan was not even publicised outside of the venue until raised by myself when a small A4 sign was attached to the main door! Hardly the free and welcoming consultation that should be expected.		
	42		Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Failure to meet NPPF 155 . I cannot answer the question below whether I raised this before because I cant remember the answer is probably!		
	104		Mrs Susan Baugh	yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No		NPPF PARA 155 NON COMPLIANT. IGNORING LOCAL RESIDENTS, INCLUDING THE VIEWS OF PARISH COUNCILS.		
	116		Mr Kevin Fraser Principal Planner, Spatial Planning Team Essex County Council Spatial Planning	yes	yes	yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No				
	128		Mr Nicholas Carey	No	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		it is not sound under NPPF para 182. It will be ineffective as there is no sound infrastructure delivery. Sections 1.13, 1.27, 1.28 and 1.31 have not been met. it is also not consistent with the policy of the NPPF. it is not meeting policy SP 6, "place shaping principles" which states that all new deve should respond positively to local charac and context to preserve and enhance the quality of existing communities and their environs. is is also not meeting policy SP 7 which states "each new garden community will confirm to the following principles..." Subsections IV, VI, VII and IX have not been met.	The local authority must adhere to the NPPF guidelines as clearly laid down.	

												does not apply with paragraph 155. ...meaningful engagement due to lack of detail. Especially with respect to west Tey. No meetings organised for local residents with developers. Doesn't comply with paragraph 10 of NPPF. Does not take in to context the constraints of historical infrastructure essentially single laned in places of coggeshall, kelvedon villages. Just because our villages lie next to the A12 and A120 it doesn't mean the roads can cope with excess development and increase in local traffic from west Tey, 1000 homes in Feering and several hundred homes in both Kelvedon and coggeshall. Neighbouring Colchester borough has grown & the local infrastructure and health provision has not kept up with pace. Gridlocked traffic around Tollgate & access roads in to Colchester. A12 and A120 at capacity with limited extra capacity even with planned improvements. There is a significant air pollution in both Bdc & cbc Does not comply with paragraph73 ....visual impact on the Essex Way.	To provide an actual map of West Tey would be a good start....but I do not feel West Tey will ever be a sound plan. They are stating it will be a self reliant garden city but all the evidence seen so far is it will become a dormitory town putting an increased strain on the local infrastructure. Where is the job provision? How will adding such significant and well above the required housing numbers be truly justified. Neighbouring colchester borough council need to respond first to it's infrastructure issues as they have consistently delivered higher numbers than the rest of the country. This level can not be sustained and for this reason I would propose a slow down and an exception is made for this area. Sort out the issues we are facing , once it has proved it is up to the present challenge and the issues the town faces then readdress the national housing problems. In the meantime concentrate on mainly affordable and social housing for it's current residents rather than trying to attract people in to the area. They have lost sight of the real issues this town is facing already due to overdevelopment Both Colchester borough council and Braintree district council failing to comply with national and local air pollution targets and legal policies set out by the clean air act. This causes a genuine risk of morbidity and mortality to it's present residents .West Tey will further increase these problems.General risk to health with overstretched health care provision. GP recruitment crisis. I work as a GP and have recorded wait times for ambulances going up in the last 4 years. I have asked for a patient to be picked up within the hour from the home due to requiring urgent hospital assessment. unless it is a blue light ( immediate risk to life ) I was advised the wait would be 7 hours. This is not safe practice. We are forced to take increasing medical risk with our patients due to shortages of ambulances in the area and wait times in the local a&e departments and bed crisis in our hosiptals. Colchester hospital has already been put in special measures due to standard of care concerns. This is largely due to bed and staff shortages . If we increase the population at the rate advised in the local plan our residents life will be put more at risk due to lack of emergency , hospital and community health provision.
134		Mrs S Osborne	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No			
143		Mrs Rosie Pearson Secretary CAUSE	No	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	CAUSE will submit a representation for Section 1 via Colchester Borough Council. We will address each element of the Plan.	CAUSE will address the many changes required to make the Plan sound/legally compliant in our full representation which will be submitted via Colchester Borough Council.	
161		Mrs Jacqueline Kingdom	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	No demonstrated duty to co-operate with neighbouring council		

	218	Mrs Geraldine Simmons Clerk Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting	Yes	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes	Para 1.5 - Misleading comment. Failure to plan strategically	Reconsult with all neighbouring authorities with a view to agreeing strategic priorities in accordance with Para 156 of the NPPF and more particularly a joined up approach to balance housing growth with upfront delivery of urgently needed improvements to infrastructure, water supplies, telecoms, adequate health facilities and mitigation of environmental and other impacts including landscape on local communities affected by any resulting development proposals
	266	Mr Edward Gittins Chartered Town Planner Edward Gittins & Associates Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered	We believe the Duty to Co-operate has not been adequately achieved in relation to Chelmsford and Uttlesford and that other elements of the Plan " such as the Settlement Hierarchy and Glossaries " have not been standardised to the same extent as the strategic policies.	Provide more information about the relationship on the proposals for how strategic issues and policies are co-ordinated with the neighbouring Districts of Uttlesford and Chelmsford in particular.
	552	St Edmundsbury Borough Council	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	We have no comments on Section 1 " the joint strategic plan with Tendring District and Colchester Borough Councils.	
	577	Ms Sarah Nicholas Senior Planning Officer Uttlesford District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	General Comments and Summary 1.15 UDC Response: Uttlesford District Council and Braintree District Council have a strong working relationship bringing forward local plans for each authority area in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate requirements. Uttlesford District Council will continue to work closely with Braintree District Council on cross boundary local planning issues and the finalisation of a Joint Memorandum of Understanding between the two authorities.	
	639	Dr Natalie Gates Principal Advisor, Historic Places Team Historic England	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered		O/S No reference to distinctive character of Essex, no reference to protecting heritage assets. Historic England request that the Strategic Objectives be amended to include a requirement for new development to have regard to the historic environment, to reflect paragraph 7 of the NPPF (the three dimensions to sustainable development).
	658	Mr and Mrs Christopher and Hazel Healey	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered	We fully endorse the current version that is to be submitted for the Braintree area local plan. Nobody likes building sites, particularly in their area but this plan is the most sensible use of available land within the boundaries of the local roads in Braintree and the new suggested "garden villages" could also enhance the area and at the same time help to fulfil the need for more housing.	
	11	Mr Stephen Archer	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	1.28 You cannot have a plan for housing without a plan for roads & other transport to serve current & future needs. This does not do this	a proper plan for roads to serve new houses & existing. I don't know about legality & am frustrated that I have to opt yes/no above!!!!

	163		Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Infrastructure and Cluster economics	
	556		Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	Delete words wherever possible. Delete word some. Add at the end add!,but not so as to compromise the principles of sustainable development. Vision for NE Essex After the word designed add..low energy demanding and renewable energy heated!. homes etc Delete!.and space for sustainable drainage solutions. 1.31 para 4 second sentence, second clause to read!, to ensure that it is secured and delivered!. Etc
	664		John and Susan Warrant	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered		1.29 The NPPF expects local authorities to set out the strategic priorities for the area in the Local Plan. Of those listed in the Framework and based on the above key issues, this strategic plan chapter addresses: the homes and jobs needed in the area the provision of infrastructure for transport and telecommunications the provision of education, health, and community infrastructure, and conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, Including landscape	
	4		Haines	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		The Spatial is too superficial. In particular, scoping fails to consider the following aspects: Availability and location of Health services. These are a significant aspect of well-being for the population. The majority of the Braintree DC (BDC) population fall within the Mid Essex Health trust - which has the majority of its delivery capabilities outside of BDC. Having a local plan that commits to population growth without having a leverage on improving local health care provision is not effective. The spatial scope fails to consider the population demographics of the area in particular a failure to difference between: (1) levels of income in-equality across the region (2) the proportions of the population that are of working age and those that are retired. There is a token, generic reference to these in Key Issues, Opportunities and Challenges, but a more detailed, fact based analysis should be provided.	
	44		Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Falling down on Garden Communities Principles	
	117		Mr Kevin Fraser Principal Planner, Spatial Planning Team Essex County Council Spatial Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Change required for clarification. The key generator of freight on the GEML is the Port of Felixstowe although Harwich contributes to this demand. ECC recommends an amendment to paragraph 1.18 as follows: The Great Eastern Main Line provides rail services between London Liverpool Street and the East of England, including Witham, Chelmsford, Colchester and Clacton-on-Sea. It also carries freight traffic to and from the Haven Ports including Harwich International Port, which handles container ships and freight transport to and from the rest of the UK. Harwich is also one of the major UK ports for ferry and cruise departures.	
	6		Haines	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		The Objectives have no quantitative targets or timescales. The plan can only be Effective if it has measurable, trackable outcomes. "Fostering Economic Development" is a process, not an Objective. Similarly "Addressing" and "Ensuring" are meaningless platitudes.	
	12		Mr Stephen Archer	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		1.31 You cannot have a plan for housing without a plan for roads & other transport to serve current & future needs. This does not do this	
	46		Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Not SMART objectives	
	51		Sport England Sport England Planning Manager Eastern Region Sport England	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		In the context of the vision for North Essex including reference to providing leisure and recreation opportunities, the importance attached in Government planning policy (paragraph 69 of the NPPF) to promoting healthy communities and the corporate health and well-being priorities of the three local authorities it is surprising that there is not a strategic objective that specifically covers creating healthier and active communities. While one of the objectives covers addressing healthcare needs, this only represents part of what is required to create healthier communities. In particular, providing opportunities for people to be physically active through leisure and recreation opportunities will be an essential requirement to help encourage healthier lifestyles	To ensure that the plan is sound in terms of meeting the justified and consistent with national policy tests It is therefore requested than an additional strategic objective is added to those listed in paragraph 1.31 (or the Addressing Education and Healthcare Needs objective is extended) which focuses on creating healthier communities through providing opportunities for physical activity in development by designing development to provide opportunities for healthy and active lifestyles, meeting leisure and recreation facilities needs (as

														well as providing for conventional health care needs) .
72		Mr Christopher Bailey Owner Agent: Mr Christopher Bailey Clockhouse Town Planning	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	☐	☐	Yes			This section makes a number of false statements. As such it is not justified. Being a core part of the plan it renders the plan ineffective and not positively prepared	Redraft this section to reflect the reality and not present an unrealistic situation from whence the plan is not sound.
559		Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No	☐	✓	✓	✓	Yes			The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	1.31 para 4 second sentence, second clause to read!, to ensure that it is secured and delivered!. Etc
43		Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	☐	☐	☐	☐	No			Not Compliant with NPPF Paragraph 155	
73		Mr Christopher Bailey Owner Agent: Mr Christopher Bailey Clockhouse Town Planning	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	☐	Yes			Apart form minor changes, this plan repeats previous methodology that caused the housing crisis which is unsustainable. It is therefore equally unsustainable and unsound.	That the Inspector rejects the entire Plan as demonstrably unsustainable and instructs the LPA top start over again using a different approach that acknowledges our community is not a centrally planned command economy but is a market democracy.
105		Mrs Susan Baugh	Yes	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No			LACK OF STRATEGIC COOPERATION BETWEEN BDC AND UDC ON WoB DEMONSTRATE A FAILURE TO ADOPT A STRATEGIC APPROACH.	
136		Mrs S Osborne	Yes	No	No	☐	✓	✓	✓	No			I feel west Tey is a complete antithesis of Nppf 17 . The sprawl,of west Tey will not take in to account the different roles and character of the different areas.It does not protect our green belt as unfortunately we have none round Colchester and Chelmsford . We are reliant on you as a planning inspector to recognise that a "green belt " of land is paramount between these different towns and settlements. By agreeing to West Tey there will be a lack of definition between settlements and loss of rural identity between settlements .They will not conserve heritage assets for future generations The over optimistic and vague with unrealistic financial contingency planning and lack of cohesiveness in their present individual council policies make it incredibly difficult for these two councils to make a success of this project. paragraph 22 lack of planning for employment site and no advantage of a enterprise zone to attract business.Earlier Haven gateway failed bid.	I can not see anyway that West Tey will work with such poor planning to date and overly optimistic and unrealistic targets.I can not see how these two councils will be able to work together and give the realistic time and money to make this a success. Their housing numbers are too high , the infrastructure is not there . There contingency financial plans too low. They are out of their depth. They have a total disregard for the protection of the communities they represent and this was reflected in the poor quality of debate at Braintree district council. At least Colchester borough council seemed to be more aware of the real issues and concerns of the residents they represent.





6020		Alexander Riley					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Large scale infrastructure should pre-empt large scale developments. There must be total adherence to the sustainable development principles expressed within the Vision for North Essex. These Garden Communities should've been developed from the ground up, was an opportunity to pilot true neighbourhood planning. Economic development and infrastructure improvement should be the initial priorities within the strategic objectives, these will facilitate the other objectives - especially housing growth.	
6157		The University of Essex (The JTS Partnership)					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The University supports the Strategic Objectives and, in particular, the acknowledgement (para 1.31) that there is a current deficit in transport infrastructure and that further investment, and provision, is needed to support new development with proposals being delivered in a phased and timely manner.	None
6269		Marks Tey Church					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The Vision for Garden Communities is good in theory; but on past performance the local population do not trust CBC to deliver this. Community assets have not been delivered (at Myland and Tollgate), and Transport & Communication Infrastructure (A12, A120, and railway) have been delayed.	None
6438		Andrew Martin Planning (representing R F West)					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The vision for the Strategic Area is fully supported, but we have reservations about the likely effectiveness of the proposed 'new approaches to delivery'. Further detail of our concerns and reasons are set out in our response to Policy SP7 in respect of our proposals for Land at East Marks Tey.	
6788		Marks Tey Parish Council (PJPC Ltd)	yes	no	yes		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The vision should include reference to the need to have regard to appropriate integration or relation with existing communities in full collaboration with those communities.	Refer to the need to have regard to integration / relation with existing adjoining communities
6810		Maree Moore	yes	no	yes		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	w	The infrastructure (ie.water, drainage, internet ) of Abberton and Langenhoe cannot cope now , so will grind to a halt with extra building in the area. Facilities such as Drs., School, are already struggling to manage due to high numbers. The traffic will increase dramatically as we have no village shop, dentist, pub which means villagers have to travel to other villages/towns. we who choose to live in the countryside do so to enjoy the wildlife and green spaces, so we do not want to see every inch built on.	Build somewhere else or reduce the numbers of properties.
6865		Martin Robeson			no		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	h	Reservations - whilst there may be constraints, these are not so significant as to frustrate the greater proportion of future development needs that districts face, Colchester in particular. Vision needs to better articulate the manner by which existing urban areas will meet challenges going forward. Vision also fails to address need to have secured economic success across the District particularly in light of strategic objectives explaining need to foster economic development.	The Vision needs to better articulate the manner by which the existing urban areas will meet the challenges going forward. Such a challenge is recognised in respect of the garden communities, but that and the challenge for the existing urban areas could be better articulated as part of the Vision.
6888		Natural England			no		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Section 1 plan needs to have a high level strategic objective and specific overarching policy on the need to protect and enhance the natural environment.	In particular, the Vision needs to reflect the particular challenges and issues for delivery wherever development is to be located.
6935		Historic England			no		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Officer summary -Disappointing that there remains no reference in para 1.31 to require development to respond to distinctive character of North Essex. No reference to protecting heritage assets and the character of existing settlements. Historic England's comments on June 2016 Draft Plan suggested that the Strategic Objectives could require "developments to respond to the distinctive character of North Essex as part of providing sufficient new homes and ensuring high quality outcomes."	Historic England request that Strategic Objectives be amended to include a requirement for new development to have regard to historic environment, to reflect paragraph 7 of the NPPF
7052		Boyer Planning (representing Andrew Mattin re Livelands)			yes		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		We support the vision where it sets out Colchester will build on its progress to regenerate further brownfield sites where they before available.	
7106		Mark Tonge					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The plan does not have a real vision. The plan is tactical rather than strategic. Where is the economic generator for East Anglia akin to a 3rd runway at Heathrow or HS2 etc. Significant infrastructure development should be a key ingredient of any local plan to make it both viable and sustainable long term to create prosperous new communities that can thrive and succeed rather than create communities that would have a higher risk of dependencies on the public purse. The plan has no economic case and there is a big difference between having a genuine economic generator and economic activity that will simply derive from the local plan.	None

7141		Sport England			no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			In the context of the vision for North Essex providing leisure and recreation opportunities, the importance attached in Government planning policy (paragraph 69 of the NPPF) to promoting healthy communities and the corporate health and well-being priorities of the three local authorities it is surprising that there is not a strategic objective that specifically covers creating healthier and active communities. The objective that covers addressing healthcare needs, only represents part of what is required to create healthier communities. Providing opportunities for people to be physically active through leisure and recreation opportunities will be essential requirement to encourage healthier lifestyles.	To ensure that the plan is sound in terms of meeting the 'justified' and consistent with national policy' tests It is therefore requested than an additional strategic objective is added to those listed in paragraph 1.31 (or the 'Addressing Education and Healthcare Needs' objective is extended) which focuses on creating healthier communities through providing opportunities for physical activity in development by designing development to provide opportunities for healthy and active lifestyles, meeting leisure and recreation facilities needs (as well as providing for conventional health care needs) .
	5	Haines	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		The Positively Prepared condition is failed if people cannot understand what is being proposed. As examples: The use of terms such as "blue infrastructure " are unclear as to their meaning. The term "garden communities" has inherent marketing bias.	
	45	Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Failure to acknowledge where growth and investment is really needed with in Essex	
	151	Henry Price	No	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The 'vision for standalone developments' is not justified in the LP and BDC has not shown adequately how it can be effective. Braintree is a failing town, pulled Eastwards by out of town shopping, and does not have the critical mass to sustain thriving retail/leisure at its centre. The obvious alternative to WoB, of focusing new housing on Braintree, has not been fully examined and fails to follow national policy on brownfield sites.	- Alternatives to WoB need to be fully examined as the draft LP fails to justify this policy otherwise. - Justification needs to be given for building on prime agricultural land. This directly contradicts the LP objective of protecting and enhancing count
	206	Mr Peter Williams Director Williams Group Agent: Mrs Teresa Cook Principal Consultant Emery Planning Partnership Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The vision for North East Essex as currently drafted raises concerns over the focus of the strategy for the development of Braintree district in the coming 20-year period. Despite most of the new housing and other built development over this period in Braintree district being planned for delivery within or alongside the existing settlements, the emphasis of the strategic vision is tilted overwhelmingly towards the progression of the new garden communities.	The Vision should include a statement placing the existing settlements and their capacity to accommodate sustainable change at the heart of the strategic vision for North Essex. Braintree (and Colchester) should be identified as the highest order settlements. The term blue infrastructure should be included in the glossary or explained elsewhere in the plan text.
	220	Mrs Geraldine Simmons Clerk Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	4634126	Para 1.30 - Proper interpretation of NPPF principles. Meaning of	
	240	Mr Bill Newman Corporate Manager - Strategic Planning Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Paragraph 1.3 refers to Braintree sharing a border with both Babergh and Mid Suffolk. Whilst this is not considered to be an issue which goes to the soundness of the Plan, in fact only Babergh District shares a border with Braintree and reference to Mid Suffolk should therefore be removed.	Reference to Mid Suffolk should be removed from paragraph 1.3.
	558	Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	After the word designed add..low energy demanding and renewable energy heated;. homes etc Delete;.and space for sustainable drainage solutions.

		LPPD13	Mrs Emma Goodings, Planning Policy Manager Braintree District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			Section 1 of the Local Plan has been constructed in close co-operation with Braintree District Council (BDC) and is supported. BDC are satisfied that Tending has addressed strategic issues, including the requirement to meet objectively assessed housing need.	None.
		LPPD19	Mr Andrew Hunter, Planning Advisor - Sustainable Places Team Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			Vision for North Essex We are supportive of the thrust of the Vision for North Essex. We are happy with the inclusion, in Objective 4, of references to ensuring that flood defence infrastructure and foul sewage infrastructure are considered by developers of future developments. The words in Objective 9 are good, but we currently have a problem with the Strategic Flood Risk Assessments' methodology for assessing the zonal extents of flood risk areas as a consequence of climate change as a means to support this objective.	None.
		LPPD30	Historic England	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			[Officer summary] It is disappointing that there remains no reference, in the strategic objectives to require development to respond to the distinctive character of North Essex and that there is no reference to protecting heritage assets and the character of existing settlements.	Include a requirement for new development to have regard to the historic environment, to reflect paragraph 7 of the NPPF (the three dimensions to sustainable development).
		LPPD34	Historic Environment Planning Adviser, Historic England	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			[Officer summary] There is no specific consideration for the historic environment within these principles. It is essential that the local plan should contain a framework to guide how the boundaries and extent of the garden communities are determined in the subsequent development plan documents. Historic Impact Assessments should be undertaken for each of the proposed broad locations.	Appropriate criteria for the protection of heritage assets and their settings need to be included in each of the policies and supporting text for the Garden Communities.
		LPPD49	Miss Jane Mower, Estates Programme Manager NHS England and NEECCG and NHSPS	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			"Broadband" please ensure that consideration is given to the technology agenda for the transformation of clinical services in the NHS. It is essential that Broadband infrastructure and connectivity is of a high speed and reliable in order to ensure that providing Primary Care at scale is achievable. The CCG would welcome inclusion in any discussions necessary with providers of broadband and telecommunications infrastructure.	None.
		LPPD52	Tetlow King, Tetlow King Planning	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			[Officer summary] The Strategic Objective for providing sufficient new homes needs to take account of future aspirations, in particular the desire to own a home in the future.	We recommend the following amendment: "Providing Sufficient New Homes" to provide for a level and quality of new homes to meet the needs and aspirations of a growing and ageing population in North Essex.
		LPPD93	Martin Robeson, Martin Robeson Planning Practice	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			[Officer summary] The Vision needs to better articulate the manner by which the existing urban areas will meet their challenges going forward. The Vision also fails to address the needs to have secured economic success across the District particularly in light of the strategic objective to "foster economic development" which is defined as including the need to "strengthen and diversify local economies...".	[Officer interpretation] Amend the vision for the Strategic Area to explain how urban areas will meet their challenges and foster economic development.

**LPA Response:** A range of opinions were expressed on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the vision and objectives for Section 1, including criticisms of the Garden Communities options, doubts over the delivery of supporting infrastructure, and concerns over the future for urban areas. Given the extent of joint work by the three authorities reflected on the overall vision for the Plan, the vision is considered to provide a comprehensive and cohesive forward plan for the area, including the innovative proposals for Garden Communities as the most sustainable approach to growth. The Councils will continue to work with stakeholders developing Statements of Common Ground and agreeing Minor Modifications as required. Council works with Suffolk authority on strategic cross border issues as required, with the Haven Gateway Partnership providing an important co-ordinating role for cross Suffolk-Essex border work. Aside from any minor modifications that may be required, no other changes are considered necessary to the introduction and vision elements of Section 1.

CBC rep ID	BD C rep ID	TDC rep ID	Name, Organisation	Legally compliant	Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/ written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan
<b>Policy SP1</b>														
6100			Richard Waylen	yes	yes	no	✓				w		Presumption in favour of sustainable development, when applied to Colchester considers the number of additional homes, but does not address existing (due to development over past 15 years) Infrastructure shortfalls or existing shortage of hospital beds, or given aging population shortage of social care provision in some areas, example West Mersea predominately aging population has no care homes. Thus proposed plan is not sustainable	Infrastructure Road improvements are not included in the plan, example journey time from West Mersea to Colchester station by car took 20 minutes in 2004, takes 35 minutes 2017, caused by no significant improvements to infrastructure as old garrison site was developed for housing. Infrastructure upgrades need to be applied to provide a southern relief route, from Clingoe Hill A134 to A12 to enable motorists to avoid town centre. Possibly by dualling route A134 to Haven Road, to Whitehall road, to Old heath road to Abbots road to Mersea road to Berechurch Hall road to Gosbecks road, to Straight road to Halstead road to A12. Assurances from NHS that Colchester Hospital will be upgraded to enable it to deliver satisfactory services to meet the rising population demands. Assurances from Network Rail and Anglia Abellio that rail services between Colchester and London will be improved (note concerns that Colchester will lose out as a result of published plans to provide Ipswich in 60 and Norwich in 90) Also consideration of further services to link Colchester with Cambridge via Ipswich.
6158			The University of Essex (The JTS Partnership)										The University of Essex fully supports the policy and the Borough Council's commitment to achieving sustainable development and to working with applicants and developers in order to 'find solutions' so that, wherever possible, development proposals, which improve economic, social and environmental conditions in the area, can proceed.	None

6274		Wivenhoe Town Council (Hazel Humphreys)	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓		A		<p>We do not believe that this is in any way sustainable. Our above representations lists why with relevant points and policy references.</p> <p>The adverse impact does not outweigh the perceived benefits.</p> <p>Tacit acceptance that it will 'go there' is deeply unpalatable for local residents</p> <p>Not sustainable to build on Grade A+ Farmland</p> <p>Poor Engagement and huge discrepancies with duty to co-operate</p> <p>No reasonable alternative seriously considered.</p> <p>9000 houses in a rural location is not proportionate.</p> <p>This iteration should account for the development to take place post 2033 as described by CBC.</p> <p>The plan is not effective as insufficient infrastructure offered.</p>	<p>The plan requires a full review and the number of dwellings proposed needs to drop to reflect local need only. Therefore 17% of the current proposal only. This plan needs to consider the impact of the 9,000 houses CBC\TDC intend to build on the site until 2048.</p> <p>Land around Wivenhoe to the South of the A133 needs to be placed into a Trust or comparable locally orientated vessel to prevent coalescence.</p> <p>Sites in and around Clacton need to be considered as wholly unjustifiable to port TDC housing needs to one over-developed area on the outskirts of Colchester.</p>
6289		Highways England										<p>We support the policies in the plan aimed at reducing the need to travel by private car, such as improved walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure, and the provision of high speed broadband allowing people to more easily communicate and work remotely reducing the demand for travel.</p>	No change
6324		Richard Gore	no	no	no		✓	✓		W		<p>new development would slow traffic further and cause greater traffic load onto a road never planned to take the amount of traffic presently using it.</p> <p>There would also be a loss of high grade farm land, as categorised by Natural England.</p> <p>Preliminary benefit those from outside the area.</p> <p>Likely to benefit individuals/couples where one is working in London rather than those only working in and around Colchester.</p> <p>Create increase pollution, noise and fumes.</p> <p>increase the serious issue of over crowding on the train service into London.</p> <p>- Destroy the rural setting around the nearby villages.</p>	<p>Improve the capacity of the train service for existing commuters and relive the congestion on the A12 and A120 first to fix the problems we have already. Build any further housing development much further north of Colchester in less well off areas such as Jaywick or Suffolk away from the pull of London</p>
6360		Sean Pordham	no	no	no		✓	✓		w		<p>Officer Interpretation: *GC at MarksTey of circa 20,000 homes is ill conceived as:</p> <p>It is in the wrong place for a new town.</p> <p>Trunk roads that are already congested and are highly polluting and have dangerous poor air quality.</p> <p>Station is poorly placed with trains already full.</p> <p>No meaningful public transport planned until 2030.</p> <p>Jobs will be difficult to provide - the councils own consultants cite these difficulties.</p> <p>As it stands, the development of a GC at Marks Tey will be nothing more than a commuter town given the current plans.</p> <p>Loss of Agricultural Land and amenity</p>	
6370		Emma Handley	yes	no	no	✓	☐	☐		w		<p>I totally object to the middlewick ranges development. This is a fantastic green space with an abundance of wildlife. This would all be destroyed along with green space for our children and future generations to enjoy.</p>	DO NOT GO AHEAD WITH THE MIDDLEWICK RANGES DEVELOPMENT.
6415		CAUSE (Rosie Pearson)	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	A	yes	<p>We find that the Plan is unsound. It is neither justified, effective, positively prepared or. Please find our full response here:  <a href="http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf">http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf</a></p>	<p>We find that the Plan is unsound. It is neither justified, effective, positively prepared or. Please find our full response here:  <a href="http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf">http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf</a></p>

6440		Andrew Martin Planning (representing R F West)										Support is extended for the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the Local Plan's approach towards considering development proposals. This accords with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).	
6485		Andrew Martin Planning (Representing Crest Nicholson)					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				Support is extended for the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the Local Plan's approach towards considering development proposals. This accords with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).	
6515		Mersea Homes (ADP Ltd)	yes	yes	no		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		yes		We are depleting the planet's resources and creating waste and pollution at an increasing rate therefore becoming less sustainable. To play its part in reversing this trend new development should become measurably more sustainable. To assist this process a neighbourhood level appraisal should be an iterative part of the urban design process. Post development analysis should be undertaken to test the effectiveness of the approach taken which will inform future action.	Add the following paragraph to policy SP1 Ongoing sustainability assessment of a Garden Community masterplans must include assessment to inform detailed design decisions, and testing of design proposals at the planning application stage. Finally, an independent post development evaluation must be undertaken to inform future development policies. A full comprehensive track change document of the Colchester Local Plan has been submitted to support all representations made by Mersea Homes [6406]. The document has been attached to this representation and can be read in conjunction with each following representation.
6527		Campaign to Protect Rural Essex	yes	yes	no		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Although garden community proposals tend, in theory, to be in accordance with sustainable development objectives, we do not consider the scale, location and potential impact of the three proposed such developments to meet these requirements and therefore question the overall soundness of the Plan.	We favour a form of urban development which minimises environmental impact, avoids the need to develop greenfield land and supports the underlying principle of reducing the need to travel. We would also prefer to see greater emphasis and encouragement of small infill schemes in second tier settlements which would create provision of much needed local affordable housing, utilise the existing infrastructure and boost the vibrancy and sustainability of local communities.

6832		William Sunnucks	yes	no	yes				✓	h		The presumption in favour of sustainable development needs to make it clear that infrastructure must be considered first. If development is to be sustainable the planning committee should be required to consider the infrastructure implications of an approval and to seek s106 or CIL contributions where appropriate. I support CAUSE's representation.	Please add a third bullet point requiring the planning committee to take the availability of adequate infrastructure into account. * There is a need to strengthen the Council's position in negotiating s106 contributions; * Timely infrastructure is key to sustainability, but too often gets left behind; * The statement in SP5 (first sentence) isn't strong enough. Please consider ways of including the &quot;infrastructure first or alongside&quot; promise in SP1. * This is a key promise repeatedly made by officers and Councillors, but the plan fails to codify it; * Public trust on infrastructure delivery is low and cynicism widespread. A change in mentality is needed, and inclusion in this key sustainability statement is a good starting point.
6866		Martin Robeson			no				x	h		Whilst this is largely a reproduction of the relevant policy text in the NPPF, we note that paragraphs 1.36 and 1.37 are inappropriately casted. Paragraph 1.36 is written on the basis that there are "no policies relevant to (note the typographical error here) the application or relevant policies are out of date...", yet in the following paragraph at 1.37 the decision maker is asked to have regard to "...the Plan..." in terms of whether it "indicates that development should be restricted". This should be amended in order to be consistent with National Policy.	Paragraphs 1.36 and 1.37 are inappropriately casted. Paragraph 1.36 is written on the basis that there are "no policies relevant to (note the typographical error here) the application or relevant policies are out of date...", yet in the following paragraph at 1.37 the decision maker is asked to have regard to "...the Plan..." in terms of whether it "indicates that development should be restricted". This should be amended in order to be consistent with National Policy.
7020		Tending District Council		yes								- Support of the Local Plan -Continued cooperation between the Councils  *Officers N.B.- The commentary has not been submitted in relation to any given policy and therefore is deemed to be applicable to the whole of Section 1 generally and therefore is lodged against SP1. the policy is also duplicated for Section 2 of the CBC Local Plan.	
7022		Andrew Granger & Co. (Mr Adam Murray)										In respect of Policy SP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, we strongly support the inclusion of this policy in the Colchester Local Plan in line with Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF]. We are encouraged by the Council's desire to positively consider proposals that contribute to the sustainable development of Colchester and North Essex.	
7036		Cushman and Wakefield								yes		The approach to the presumption in favour of sustainable development is that set out in the NPPF. However, we consider the council should make clear in the preceding paragraph to SP1 (ie para 2.1) that in accordance with S38(6) of the Act, and the guidance of the NPPF, that development decision should be carried out in accordance with the development plan, unless there are material considerations to indicate otherwise. One such consideration is the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which is rehearsed in SP1.	
7159		Gladman Development (Mathieu Evans)	yes	yes	yes					h	yes	Gladman are fully supportive of the inclusion of the policy on sustainable development. The ethos of sustainable development is key to assessing planning proposals, it is the golden thread running through the NPPF.	None
7227		Colne Housing Society Ltd	yes	yes	yes					w		We support the council's ideas for the long term aims and aspirations of the borough taking into account national guidance and evidence as well as a SA. We recognise the need to deliver 920 new homes up to 2033 is a challenge. The proposals for two new garden communities provides opportunities to both share the growth provision and infrastructure with neighbouring local authorities. We also support the proposed growth district centres identified in Tiptree, Wivenhoe and West Mersea.	n/a



59	Mr Mark East	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		The criteria for development should be on the basis that there is sound evidence that there is sufficient demand for affordable housing in each Parish. I believe that compliance with "The Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017" requires greater recognition as it is now a statutory duty on LPA's.	
108	Mr Paul Gibbs Bellway Homes Ltd Agent: Mr Olivier Spencer Associate Andrew Martin Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	4632904	In respect of Policy SP1, Bellway Homes supports the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the Local Plan's approach towards considering development proposals. This accords with the same presumption in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).	n/a
153	Henry Price	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		SP1 - The policy of presumption in favour of sustainable development is not sound as it is drafted in such vague language that assessments of sustainability cannot be properly and objectively challenged. 'Sustainability' is a subjective concept and without rigorous guidelines as to the meaning, definitions and manner in which the BDC will judge planning applications against this criteria, it is impossible for the policy to be effective, as the law demands. As set out this policy is a charter for BDC to approve whatever it wants on the ground of a subjective judgement as to the application's 'sustainability'. The policy is also unsound as BDC has failed to justify its stance on the issue.	
165	Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		NPPF paragraph 155	
183	Bellway Homes Limited - Strategic Growth Agent: Mr Andrew Martin Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Support is extended for the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the Local Plan's approach towards considering development proposals. This accords with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).	
200	Mr & Mrs Andrew Martin Agent: Mr Andrew Martin Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Support is extended for the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the Local Plan's approach towards considering development proposals. This accords with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).	
207	Mr Peter Williams Director Williams Group Agent: Mrs Teresa Cook Principal Consultant Emery Planning Partnership Ltd	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		We would support the presumption in favour of sustainable development.	
221	Mrs Geraldine Simmons Clerk Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 restates selective parts of Para 14 of the NPPF and as such fails to provide a sound foundation for assessment of alternative development proposals. The supposed benefits of Policy SP10 and the Garden Community proposals generally are not proven to be sufficient to outweigh the obvious attraction of more immediate sequential development solutions based on the improvement of existing infrastructure and services	Rewrite Policy SP1 to put affordable housing delivery at the heart of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Low density high cost Garden Communities are not the solution to meeting the housing needs of the current generation of young families and house buyers

	243	Environment Agency Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No		Vision for North Essex We are supportive of the thrust of the Vision. We are encouraged by the Vision advocating that Green and blue infrastructure, among other things, will be planned and provided along with other facilities to support the development of substantial new growth. Policy SP 1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development We are supportive of the thrust of this policy.	
	474	Choice Construction Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
	475	Barkley Projects Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
	476	Mr Watson-Steele Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
	477	Mr Gavin Day DSG Development s Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
	478	Mr D P Nott Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
	479	Granville Development s Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
	480	Mr Lightly Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
	481	Mrs D Golding Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.

		Gittins & Associates														
482		Mr W Kerry Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.			
483		Pertwee Estates Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.			
484		Mrs J Scarlett Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.			
485		Mrs J Scarlett Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.			
486		Mrs J Sawyer Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.			
487		Mr C Coghlan Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.			
488		Mr R Carter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.			
489		Mr R Carter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.			

490	Mr Martin Cowan Poplar Nurseries Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ye s	Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
491	Mr M Spurgeon Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ye s	Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
492	Mr D Clough Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ye s	Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
493	Mr & Mrs Harrison Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ye s	Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
494	The Shepherd Trust Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ye s	Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
495	Mr C Reid Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ye s	Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
496	Mr D White Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ye s	Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
497	Mssrs Parmenter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ye s	Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.

498	Mrs D Morrall Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ye s	Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
499	Mr C Hart Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ye s	Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
500	Mr M Allard Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ye s	Policy SP1 fails to provide clear guidance on sustainable development. The lack of definition of what constitutes sustainable development detracts from the vision for the strategic area.	In order to clarify the meaning of sustainable development in SP1, reflect the wording of the third bullet point above in the Vision for the Strategic Area and in the Strategic Objectives.
511	Hills Residential Hills Residential Agent: Mr Kevin Coleman Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ye s	Deletion of the first sentence of the second paragraph on the basis that it appears to introduce an unnecessary and inappropriate additional test for all development to demonstrate compliance with the Vision and Objectives of the plan. Reference to 'or the Plan' should be deleted from the bullet point at the end of the Policy on the basis that its inclusion is illogical and inappropriate.	Please see comments above.
513	Mr Chris Gatland SEE AGENT DETAILS Agent: Mr Tom Davies Planning Potential	Yes	Yes	Ye s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Summary As stated above, Redrow support the principles put forward in the Local Plan in general and the continued allocation of the Rayne Lodge site for residential development, and particular the minimum housing target as specified in LPP17, as this is consistent with Paragraph 47 of the NPPF which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing.	
533	A Stevenson Agent: Mr Trevor Dodkins Director Phase 2 Planning & Developmen	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ye s	OFFICER RESPONSE SP1 should reflect NPPF para 13 and para 15 that policies in Local Plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Dorewards Hall land can contribute towards the Braintree Districts housing needs in a high quality, design led development.	
537	Mr Brian Day Agent: Mr Trevor Dodkins Director Phase 2 Planning & Developmen	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ye s	Halstead has a good range of shops and services and the Chapel Hill land represents a key opportunity to deliver sustainable development.	

	540		Mr J Still Braintree Golf Club Ltd. Agent: Mr Trevor Dodkins Director Phase 2 Planning & Developmen	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ye s		Officer response: 3 The Rectory Road Hill land represents a key opportunity to deliver sustainable development. Stisted is a medium sized village with a primary school, village hall, community shop, recreation area, public house, church and private recreation facilities.	
	544		Mr Phil Bamford Planning Manager Gladman Development s Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ye s		O/S - Please see Table 1 at para 2.3.1 of the attached representation for a summary of Gladman's representation.	
	568		The Crown Estate Office Agent: Ms Helena Deaville Amec Foster Wheeler	Question not answered	Question not answere d	Ye s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ye s		O/S - Welcome the policy Crown Estate keen to work with BDC and other stakeholder at Strategic Growth location at Feering.	
		LPPD4	Mr Andrew Martin, Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	Ye s							Support is extended for the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the Local Plan's approach towards considering development proposals. This accords with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).	None.
		LPPD6	Mr Andrew Martin, Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	Ye s							Support is extended for the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the Local Plan's approach towards considering development proposals. This accords with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)(2012).	None.
		LPPD2 0	Mr Andrew Hunter, Planning Advisor - Sustainable Places Team Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	Ye s							[Officer summary] We are supportive of the thrust of this policy.	None.
		LPPD9 4	Martin Robeson, Martin Robeson Planning Practice	Yes	Yes	No				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			[Officer summary] Whilst this is largely a reproduction of the relevant policy text in the NPPF, the final paragraph is written on the basis that there are are policies relevant to (note the typographical error here ['o' instead of 'to]) the application or relevant policies are out of date, yet in the following sentence the decision maker is asked to have regard to the Plan in terms of whether it indicates that development should be restricted* . This is clearly a non sequitur and should be amended in order to be consistent with National Policy.	[Officer interpretation] Amend the final paragraph of the policy to be consistent with the NPPF.
		LPPD7 6	Jill Hughes, AM Planning	Yes	Yes	Ye s							Support is extended for the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the Local Plan's approach towards considering development proposals. This accords with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).	None.
		LPPD8 5	Phil Bamford, Gladman	Yes	Yes	Ye s							Gladman are fully supportive of the inclusion of the policy on Sustainable Development. The ethos of sustainable development is key to assessing planning proposals, it is the golden thread running through the NPPF.	None.

	LPPD8 6	Phil Bamford, Gladman	Yes	Yes	No					✓				[Officer summary] New garden villages of typically 1,000-1,500 dwelling can be developed in places where there is considerable existing infrastructure and can be brought forward relatively quickly. Such proposals, if carefully selected, can contribute dwelling completions within the first 5-10 years of a plan period, thus giving the Council more of a buffer. The spatial strategy needs to recognise new garden villages as well as the larger garden settlements. These, in addition to the smaller allocations, will help the plan soundly meets its housing targets. Whilst there is support for elements of policy SP2, without provision for the medium size sites, such as new Garden Villages we consider the spatial strategy would be problematic in delivering housing needs. We therefore consider it inconsistent with National Policy and not justified or effective and as such unsound.	[Officer interpretation] Inclusion of 'garden villages' of 1,000-1,500 dwellings in the strategy for the Local Plan.
--	------------	--------------------------	-----	-----	----	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

**LPA Response:** Some respondents queried compliance of aspects of the policy with the NPPF which can be explored through the examination process to ensure that policies adequately reflect the need to demonstrate accordance with national policy while avoiding duplication. The Councils agree that infrastructure is a key requirement of sustainable development and believe this is adequately covered within the text of SP1 but would be willing to consider potential alternative wording on this point through the examination process. The spatial strategy has been supported by a thorough examination of the alternative spatial options. Aside from any minor modifications that may be required, no other changes are considered necessary to SP1.

CBC rep ID	BDC rep ID	TDC rep ID	Name, Organisation	Legally compliant	Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/ written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan
<b>Policy SP2</b>														
6071			Wal Andrews	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	w		There seems to be a lack of overall leadership and responsibility when considering the cumulative impact on local infrastructure, environment and actual needs of each individual 'neighbourhood plan' and new towns proposed within the East Anglia region. It seems to me to be adding up to a total disaster at so many levels all of which can be avoided and solve most of our housing shortage with a more considered long term approach to planning that MUST include investment in local businesses and infrastructure. This comment is across each part of this consultation.	This whole Local Plan and each individual 'Neighbourhood Plan' across the whole East Anglia region seems to be cumulatively a complete economic, infrastructure and environmental disaster. Everything should be scrapped and a restart after listening to what the objectors are saying.
6101			Richard Waylen	no	yes	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	w		Insufficient proposals for Infrastructure upgrades. Road, Rail, NHS, Assumption seems to be based on changing peoples travel habits which won't work unless services are improved before development. Particular attention to traffic black spots required as stationary traffic causes the most pollution and this has not been addressed by the plan	Assurances need to be made to ensure development follows Infrastructure upgrades and no existing journey times are made worse.

6159		The University of Essex (The JTS Partnership)				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			The University of Essex supports the overarching spatial strategy as set out in this Section and in Policy SP2.	None
6206		North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		yes	The NHS would like to ensure that appropriate healthcare facilities are sited to support the Garden Community Developments. As per the IDP update issued both by email on 28th July 2017 and the attached please ensure that the NHS are fully engaged in the process as the Garden Community projects unfold.	
6232		Richard Aggiss	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	w		Spatial strategy but not compliant with NPPF155	Stop it , rethink. Alternatives as per Kerslake report.
6236		Feering Parish Council	yes	no	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	✓	h	yes	Section 1 of the Publication Draft Local Plans is stated as being the same for Braintree, Colchester & Tendring but in terms of maps this is not the case. Map 3.3 and the Proposals Map referenced in Policy SP2 are not included. Different maps at different scales are included. Most of the maps are "half-maps" which stop at district / borough borders. The Braintree LP includes 5 maps - three are "half-maps". The Colchester LP includes one "overview" map. The Tendring LP only includes one half-map. The full extent of the garden communities is not presented and cannot be assessed.	That the referenced maps - Map 3.3 and the Proposals Map in Policy SP2 and the "adopted policies map(s)" are included. That a consistent set of maps showing the entire extent of each of the three proposed garden community to the same scale are produced and included.
6275		Wivenhoe Town Council	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	A		Without any defined proposed boundaries for the communities there is insufficient information to comment on their sustainability and impact. More detail on viability is required and justification in terms of future housing needs post 2032. There does not appear to be a Map 3.3 or a Proposals Map in the Part I documents. The Tendring proposals map for the garden community shows a different area, straddling the A133. There is no provision to protect the existing character of the area.	Postpone the Tendring/Colchester development until the boundaries have been defined and we can reflect and comment on actual fact and have a greater understanding on its impact and therefore play a greater part in genuine Community Engagement. We also wish to be a part of the Master plan process.
6343		Wivenhoe Society	yes	yes	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	h		The Garden Settlement Proposals are unsound because there is insufficient detail on the precise sites proposed. There is a key diagram but no proposals map. The proposals maps for Colchester and Tendring show a different proposed areas for the East Colchester garden settlement The impact on existing communities cannot be assessed without much more information on precise sites and on infrastructure , in particular the road network.	More detail is required about the precise sites
6361		Sean Pordham	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	w		1. The GC at Marks Tey is in the wrong place for a new town. 2. The various committees terms of reference are unclear and what they can and cannot do - this will result in developers getting what they want. 3. Jobs will be difficult to provide - the councils own consultants cite these difficulties.	1. The GC at Marks Tey is in the wrong place for a new town. 2. The various committees terms of reference are unclear and what they can and cannot do - this will result in developers getting what they want. 3. Jobs will be difficult to provide - the councils own consultants cite these difficulties.



6393		Highways England				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			Until housing and employment is committed the above 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.	None
6416		CAUSE (Rosie Pearson)	no	no	no	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A	yes	See: <a href="http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf">http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf</a>  CAUSE is supported by planning consultants, transport consultants and urban designers. We represent over 1,000 local residents. We find that the decision to include three new garden settlements in the Local Plan is unsound, and recommends that two of the three (SP9 & SP10) should be dropped.  The Sustainability Appraisal is the only document to attempt to justify two key decisions adopting the garden community development format and the choice of West Tey (SP9) as a location. The analysis is subjective and ignores both cost and viability. It is not fit for purpose.	See page 12 of the CAUSE response for necessary amendments to the Plan: <a href="http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf">http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf</a>
6429		CPREssex	yes	yes	no	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	w		CPRE Colchester group recognise the theoretical advantages in the garden community concept. However, we do not believe the Council has demonstrated that it can implement its proposals to achieve the balanced communities with sufficient local employment; nor that it is sufficiently certain at this stage that the major infrastructure investment needed can be achieved ahead of the development taking place. The consequences will be loss of countryside and important agricultural land and the establishment, in the case of West Tey, of a commuter dormitory.	The inclusion of the Garden communities to be contingent on the necessary mechanisms being in place to ensure the necessary infrastructure can be delivered ahead of development and that sufficient employment can be secured to ensure a balanced community.
6430		RSPB				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			The RSPB supports the intention for "conservation and enhancement of the natural environment" beyond the main settlement boundaries within the main policy.  We also note and support that this is explicitly referenced in paragraph 3.1 of the supporting evidence for this policy and can therefore be considered sound.	
6441		Andrew Martin (representing R F West)				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			We support the proposals for growth in Colchester that initially continue to focus on the urban area of Colchester. However, in recognition that the urban area has a limited and diminishing supply of available brownfield sites, we support the proposal to meet large-scale, housing-led, mixed-use development on greenfield sites including within new Garden Communities. We acknowledge the increasing requirement for greenfield land to achieve the range of sustainability objectives outlined in the emerging local plan for Colchester.	
6516		Mersea Homes (ADP Ltd)	yes	yes	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	h	yes	Whilst the plan only identifies broad locations for new Garden Communities the indicative blobs on map 33 have been formed to include or exclude areas which detail should only take place at the master plan stage under a new development plan document.	The key diagram to which policy SP2 refers in paragraph 10.1 should have blurred edges which covers the wider area thus avoiding any apparent site specific intentions. A full comprehensive track change document of the Colchester Local Plan has been submitted to support all representations made by Mersea Homes [6406]. The document has been attached to the representation made on Policy SP1 [ID: 6515] and can be read in conjunction with each representation.

6518		Mersea Homes (ADP Ltd)	yes	yes	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	h	yes	There is confusion over the use of both Garden City principles and the Garden City Charter which is a recent document contained in the Councils' evidence base. For clarity reference should only be made to the Garden City Charter and a definition added in the Glossary.	In the 5th paragraph delete &quot;Garden City principles&quot; and substitute with &quot;Garden City Charter&quot;. A full comprehensive track change document of the Colchester Local Plan has been submitted to support all representations made by Mersea Homes [6406]. The document has been attached to the representation made on Policy SP1 [ID: 6515] and can be read in conjunction with each representation.
6536		Campaign to Protect Rural Essex	yes	yes	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	h		The Plan will impact detrimentally on the character of the local landscape and existing settlements will be adversely affected to an unacceptable level. Also, the spatial distribution of the housing growth is not closely aligned to the strategically significant employment growth areas of the Plan.	We would wish to see more support for a &quot;brownfield first&quot; approach in the Plan. A report published by CPRE (October 2016) evidenced the fact that the capacity of brownfield land to deliver housing has been under estimated and the new brownfield registers have resulted in significant increases in the number and housing capacity of suitable brownfield sites - particularly in the East and South East regions, where pressure is greatest. Rather than the urbanisation of open countryside, the loss of very good quality agricultural land and integrity loss for existing settlements, the NPPF should be upheld and major housing development should take place first on land of poorer quality and in more sustainable locations, such as Middlewick Ranges, before greenfield sites on higher quality land are developed.
6557		Copford with Easthorpe Parish Council				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			Copford with Easthorpe Parish Council accept the need for an increased number of homes but would wish to proffer their comments as included in the enclosed document and would suggest that there are other locations fit for development within Copford apart from Hall Lane and Queensbury Avenue	None
6604		Mersea Homes (ADP Ltd)	yes	yes	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	h	yes	Spatial strategy paragraph 3.1 & 3.2 - These paragraphs set out proposals for new strategic scale settlements to be included in the Plan's Part 1. However, it is not made clear which provisions within Part 1 refer also to Part 2. There are considerable overlaps on matters such as sustainability, expected standards of design, climate change, provision of sport facilities and housing standards. Also, it is not clear why, if supposing Part 1 policies only apply to the strategic sites, standards should be different between strategic and local development.	A paragraph should be added under 3.2 clarifying exactly what issues are directed at which part of the plan and clarification to explain the different standards in each part. A full comprehensive track change document of the Colchester Local Plan has been submitted to support all representations made by Mersea Homes [6406]. The document has been attached to the representation made on Policy SP1 [ID: 6516] and can be read in conjunction with each representation.
6738		Mike Lambert	no	no	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	h	yes	The scale of development proposed in this Plan but outside the Plan period to 2033 is premature and relies on future DPDs, which may or may not demonstrate the NGCs are viable and/or deliverable. The DtC does not demonstrate sufficient integration of plan making across the whole sub region, including Chelmsford City, Maldon District and Babergh District to justify a decision in principle on the NGCs at this stage.	Delete final paragraph and replace with a commitment to identify land at three Strategic Growth Locations (SGL) for up to 7500* new homes in the Plan period to 2033, with no more than 2500 in any one location. Development at any SGL shall be subject to a separate DPD identifying clear boundaries to the initial phases of development, a clear set of infrastructure commitments for which there must be at least certainty of funding and delivery prior to any commencement of development, and where appropriate demonstrate that they can be delivered without prejudicing the delivery of any larger scale growth** that may be proposed in the DPD, once there is greater clarity on the justification, delivery and viability for such larger scale growth. Note *: or such lower figure that emerges from an Examination of the OAN for all three Councils Note **: the ambition and potential for these Strategic Growth Locations to accommodate larger scale developments beyond the 2500 can be highlighted in supporting text but the current Plan should contain no commitment to development for more than this figure.

6733		Mark Massetti	yes	no	yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	w	Lack of infrastructure for the area - I am concerned at the lack of infrastructure and the roads are currently congested, the overriding concern for me is that further congestion will lead to higher levels of noise and air pollution. It is my belief that further air pollution will go against the Local Plan policy on healthy living. Another concern of mine is that we do not have enough school and community facility for the area at present and resources will be further stretched should these plans go ahead.	Do not allow the plan to go ahead
6739		Marks Tey Parish Council (PJPC Ltd)	yes	no	yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	h	Greater clarity is needed in terms of what the Garden Communities are intended to achieve and the specific principles set out clearly and concisely within the policy to provide clear guidance for further policy in the DPD and to guide appropriate development. It should also require that integration and relationships with existing communities are vital in collaboration with those communities.	Include reference to specific Garden Communities policies SP7, SP8, SP9
6837		Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting (Fenn Wright)	yes	no	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Lack of clarity as to what the draft Local Plan for North Essex sees as the benefit to existing and future residents of the Garden Community Principles and as a result clear guidance as to how the Plan will be interpreted when seeking to put those principles into effect. No clear concept of what the Garden Communities can deliver than cannot be delivered by more traditional sequential development in the form of Master Planned Urban Extensions	Delete the final paragraph of Policy SP2 commencing - Three new garden communities and replace with; &quot; Where planned extensions to existing settlements and sustainable villages within each District is shown not be able to accommodate the necessary level of housing growth then consideration will be given to identifying one or more new Garden Communities capable of accommodating up to 7,500 new homes in the Plan period in North Essex. This Garden Community to be developed based upon the principles of Policy SP7 (as amended).
6867		Martin Robeson			no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	h	We generally support the approach set out in this policy but would recommend that the first sentence of the second paragraph includes reference to the "improvement" of existing settlements through future growths. The Plan would thus be more positively prepared. Plan appears to limit itself unnecessarily to explaining how sustainable development principles can be best applied to achieving the spatial strategy by giving only one such example. Concerned paragraph 1.38 refers to "The countryside will be protected..." since countryside should not be protected for its own sake.	First sentence of the second paragraph should include reference to the "improvement" of existing settlements through future growth. Specific changes on two furRecommend that the first sentence of the second paragraph includes reference to the "improvement" of existing settlements through future growths. The Plan would thus be more positively prepared. In addition, the Plan appears to limit itself unnecessarily to explaining how sustainable development principles can be best applied to achieving the spatial strategy by giving only one such example i.e. through ensuring that development locations are "accessible by a choice of means of travel". However, there are a number of important principles that can usefully be expressed within such a policy, for example improving the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure. Whilst not part of the policy text, we are very concerned that at paragraph 1.38 there is a reference to "The countryside will be protected...". We consider that designations providing protection across rural areas need to be focused on achieving a particular task.ther points not provided.
6937		Historic England			no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Amend second paragraph to ensure reference to settlements maintaining their distinctive and historic character. Policy should avoid coalescence between settlements. Supporting text should set out what policy means for North Essex in respect of high quality built and urban design.	first sentence of paragraph 2 of the Policy is amended as follows: Future growth will be planned to ensure settlements maintain their distinctive character and role, and to avoid coalescence between them. Additional wording suggested but not provided on further guidance specific to North Essex.
7023		Andrew Granger & Co. (Mr Adam Murray)				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		We support the proposed spatial strategy for growth set out in Policy SP2: Spatial Strategy for North Essex. The NPPF and the Draft Local Plan are underpinned by a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. It is therefore considered rational to direct development towards locations that are accessible and are within close proximity to a wide range of employment opportunities and local services and facilities.	

7048		Boyer Planning (representing Andrew Mattin re Livelands)			yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		yes	See attached Statement - We continue to support that development will be accommodated within or adjoining settlements, and that the re-use of previously-developed land within settlements is an important objective. This is in accordance with paragraph 111 of the NPPF that planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land). We agree with the approach to the development of the new garden communities. Notwithstanding this point, our client's land would in any event represent a previously developed site that could help to contribute to the spatial strategy.	
7160		Gladman Development (Mathieu Evans)	yes	yes		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	h	yes	Gladman support the policy in recognising that the level of growth to be apportioned to a settlement will depend on the needs of that settlement and that in particular the diversification of the rural economy will be important. It will be important for the spatial strategies of the individual local plans to have these issues in mind when allocating sites and considering planning applications.... Gladman consider that the council may wish to further assess proposals for new garden villages. These new settlements of typically 1,000-1,500 dwellings can be developed in places where there is existing infrastructure.	None
7479		Lightwood Strategic										Monks Wood should be identified as part of the shared spatial strategy for North Essex. Full representation form and documents attached to support this	
	60	Mr Mark East	No	Yes	No	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	No		3.3 I do not concur that development along the A12 is sound on grounds of increased risk to health through pollution. With the A12 widening we can expect increased volumes in traffic generating pollution.	
	76	Mr Christopher Bailey Owner Agent: Mr Christopher Bailey Clockhouse Town Planning	Yes	Yes	No	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		In the glossary there is a definition of countryside. It reads "any area outside defined development boundaries". The last sentence of this paragraph refers to countryside. As such it should use the definition from the glossary so the last sentence reads:- "The areas outside defined development boundaries will be protected and enhanced". Sadly such a sentence makes no sense in the context of a fundamental spatial strategy. As such the plan is not positively prepared and hence unsound.	Redraft the last sentence to use the3 definition of countryside from the glossary so that it reads:-"The areas outside defined development boundaries will be protected and enhanced".

	78	Mr Christopher Bailey Owner Agent: Mr Christopher Bailey Clockhouse Town Planning	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		In the glossary there is a definition of countryside. It reads "any area outside defined development boundaries". The last sentence of this paragraph refers to countryside. As such it should use the definition from the glossary so the last sentence reads:- "The areas outside defined development boundaries will be protected and enhanced". Sadly such a sentence makes no sense in the context of a fundamental spatial strategy. As such the plan is not positively prepared and hence it cannot be effective.	Recognise there is no social or economic distinction between areas inside and outside arbitrary lines on bits of paper and redraft the policy to take account of such.
--	----	---	-----	-----	----	---	---	---	--------------------------	-----	--	--	--

	89	Mssrs Addison and Bailey Agent: Mr Christopher Bailey Clockhouse Town Planning	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The spatial strategy is being undermined by the restrictions on development being proposed later in the plan.	Recognise the existing negative approach to development has created the housing crisis referred to in the Housing White Paper. Redraft the development management policies to facilitate development instead of placing obstacles and restrictions in the way of development.
	127	Mr Joe Venner Managing Director F H Nash Ltd Agent: Mr Chris Loon Director Springfields Planning and Development Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		We object to this policy as it implies the council is unsupportive of the re-use of previously developed land (PDL) outside of settlements. The policy notes the important objective of re-using PDL sites only "within" settlements. However, those land owners of PDL sites outside settlements are left with a lack of clarity how their sites fit in with the overall strategy, as well as how the policy complies with the NPPF Core Principle regarding the effective re-use of PDL sites (irrespective of location). Similar Objections were raised in the representation to the Reg 18 consultation - see letter dated 18 August 2016.	The effective re-use of all previously developed land, to comply with para 17 of the NPPF, should be stated as an important objective as part of the spatial strategy
	140	Mrs S Osborne	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No		urban sprawl loss of rural identity and separation of villages and hamlets risk of loss of tourism Nppf 28 , change the attractiveness of the area. Less rural. Less historical context. Loss of protection and conservation of countryside and agricultural land between settlements Nppf 28 poor infrastructure provision Nppf paragraph 29, safety issues monks farm development , kelvedon nppf paragraph 32 and 35. Increased congestion locally Nppf 9 poor job provision, west Teyn nppf 28 unrealistic financial contingency planning. West Tey Nppf 17 over congested approaches to Colchester due to previous over development which hasn't matched infrastructure demands. Nppf 30 housing requirements should be reduced in local plan due to infrastructure limitations and local health provision. Nppf 11	to take out west Tey as a viable plan due to lack of infrastructure , job provision and the negative effects on adjacent local villages. Coggeshall, feering, Kelvedon.
	170	Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Symantics	
	222	Mrs Geraldine Simmons Clerk Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Policy SP2 - Void for uncertainty as to timing and delivery	

624		Mr Douglas McNab Forward Planning Manager - South East Education and Skills Funding Agency Department For Education	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		The ESFA notes that significant growth in the housing stock is expected across the North Essex districts of Braintree, Colchester and Tendring; the Local Plan confirms the annual housing target of 2,186 new homes a year (43,720 in total) for this area (excluding Chelmsford) over the plan period 2013 to 2037. The specific requirement for Braintree District is 716 homes per year (14,320 in total). This will place significant pressure on social infrastructure such as education facilities.	
19		Mr Peter Conlon	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		O/S - Infrastructure should be provided first. Loss of countryside, too much social housing, attract better quality housing and business into the area.	
26		Mr David Tarbun	Question not answered	Question not answered	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		In general I am against development on green belt land. Brown land should be used extensively and council house development should have been dropped. Housing association developments are a 'passing the buck' process where developments are proceeded with section 106 and 'affordable housing' numbers should be built first before private and developers made to stick to plans as passed. Private development for sale as a commercial project are only good for the economy in the short term and developers profit. I am concerned about whether access, infrastructure and congestion problems are thought through enough in planning decisions.	
27		Mr Alan Pryor	Question not answered	Question not answered	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		1. Environmental " water etc Stansted pollution 2. Road systems. A120 " A12 3. Detailed infrastructure (lack of) 4. Community size	Small environmentally sustainable communities " 5,000 people max.
31		mr wesley dearsley	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		There seems to be no regard given to improving existing infrastructure/amenities eg schools, doctors, parks, roads. Particular in Kelvedon it appears the priority was amended to develop Monks Farm rather than extend the village toward Witham. I understand the extension out of the village would have accomodated a doctors surgery and school. However, the plan was changed to favour Monks Farm with the pupose of building more houses. The infrastructure is already strained in the village, will schools oversubscribed, doctors surgerys at bursting, trains full and roads jammed. The extension from Kelvedon to Marks Tey will also create strain on existing infrastructure to bursting point and destroy the villages and become urban sprawl	Provide/Improve schools, roads, provide amenities (doctors, park)
47		Mr Stephen Walsh vice chairman Unex Group Holdings Limited Agent: Mr Greg Pearce Senior Planner David Lock Associates	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	4633504	O/S - Supports the overall strategy. Allocation of Towerlands site is supported and is an effective reuse of previously developed land of limited environmental value.	

65	Mr John August Galliard Homes Ltd Agent: Mr Martin Herbert WYG	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	O/S - Support spatial strategy, close liaison between the Council and developers is required.	
77	Mr Christopher Bailey Owner Agent: Mr Christopher Bailey Clockhouse Town Planning	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	This policy makes false statements about transport infrastructure natural environment and fails to recognise the existing congested condition of the larger settlements in the area. As such it is based on false assumptions and thus not positively prepared unsound and will be ineffective.	Redraft the policy recognising that the existing settlements have already reached their limits to growth; that there is no natural environment and giving greater weight to enabling land within development boundaries to be developed.
86	Mrs Karen Melville-Ross Clerk Ashen PC	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	the parish council support the overall strategy	
110	Mr Paul Gibbs Bellway Homes Ltd Agent: Mr Olivier Spencer Associate Andrew Martin Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Bellway Homes supports the approach in Policy SP2, which if taken literally, should ensure that the most sustainable settlements in the district accommodate the bulk of the additional growth envisaged in the Braintree Local Plan Publication Draft.	n/a
154	Henry Price	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The spatial strategy is unsound as BDC has entirely failed to justify its policy of developing garden communities. The policy is baldly stated, with no explanation or reasoning, or examination of the alternatives. It is a radical policy, that has already proved to be extremely unpopular in the target areas as well as across the wider county, and BDC has failed to make any proper case in support of it and has failed to consult locally to any noticeable or reasonable extent. The policy is also unsound as the garden community plans are so early stage and vague that BDC has failed to show how the policy will be effective. The Kerslake Report has already set out areas in which the strategy is not sound, in particular in its 'key challenges and recommendations' section and none of these have yet been adequately addressed in the draft local plan. Lord Kerslake in particular notes the lack of assessment of reasonable alternatives, and the weakness of BDCs advocacy on sustainability and viability.	The spatial strategy needs justification; proper examination of alternatives and demonstration of its potential effectiveness.
164	Bovis Homes Ltd Agent: Mr Leslie Short Director Artisan Planning & Property Services	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	Greater flexibility should be built into policy SP2 to provide scope for the Council to entertain alternative sites should the principal allocations of the 3 new, large Garden Village communities or indeed other large scale sites allocated in the Plan. Whilst we are supportive of the generality of the Councils overall approach in Policy SP2 in meeting housing needs, we do not believe that the Council in allocating appropriate levels of growth to match that need, has applied it appropriately or evenly throughout the District.	
172	Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	No joined up thinking	



184		Bellway Homes Limited - Strategic Growth Agent: Mr Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		O/S - Support the spatial strategy for North Essex as main towns provide infrastructure and employment.	n/a
199		Mr & Mrs Andrew Martin Agent: Mr Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		O/S - Support the spatial strategy for North Essex as main towns provide infrastructure and employment.	n/a
208		Mr Peter Williams Director Williams Group Agent: Mrs Teresa Cook Principal Consultant Emery Planning Partnership Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	4634362	The Spatial Strategy for North Essex in SP2 itself is confused. On the one hand it states that existing settlements will be the principal focus for additional growth across North Essex yet the plan then goes on, in subsequent policies, to place an over-reliance on delivery of growth in the new garden communities, in contrast to the Frameworks approach. Development to the south east of Braintree would comply with the stated aim of Policy SP2 to focus additional growth in the principal settlement.	This strategic policy needs to identify the highest order settlement, namely Braintree (and Colchester) and explicitly identify them as the focus for growth. . The garden communities are no more than conceptual at this stage and should be identified as a lower order settlement. The detail of the strategic hierarchy needs to be identified so that the weight to be given to development proposals can be assessed.
244		Environment Agency Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No		Vision for North Essex We are supportive of the thrust of the Vision. We are encouraged by the Vision advocating that Green and blue infrastructure, among other things, will be planned and provided along with other facilities to support the development of substantial new growth. Policy SP 2 Spatial Strategy for North Essex We are supportive of the thrust of this policy and that the three Garden Communities will be planned and developed drawing on Garden City principles, with necessary infrastructure and facilities provided and a high quality of place-making and urban design. There may be merit in reinforcing the desire to follow Garden City principles by making reference to the principles reflecting the Garden City principles espoused by the Town and Country Planning Association. See for instance The Art of Building a Garden city: Designing New Communities for the 21 st Century.	

416	Choice Construction Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--

418	Barkley Projects Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	---	---	--------------------------	-----	--	--

420	Mr Watson-Steele Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<p>The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.</p>	<p>Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.</p>
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	---	---

422	Mr Gavin Day DSG Developments Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--

424	Mr D P Nott Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	---	---	--------------------------	-----	--	--

428	Granville Developments Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--

430	Mr Lightly Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--



432	Mrs D Golding Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--	--

434	Mr W Kerry Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--	--

436	Pertwee Estates Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--

438	Mr G Williamson Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	---	---	--------------------------	-----	--	--

440	Mrs J Scarlett Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--	--

443	Mrs J Sawyer Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--

444	Mr C Coghlan Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	--------------------------	---	---	--------------------------	-----	--	--

446	Mr R Carter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--



448	Mr M Harrington Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--

450	Mr Martin Cowan Poplar Nurseries Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--

453	Mr M Spurgeon Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--

454	Mr D Clough Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--

456	Mr & Mrs Harrison Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--

458	The Shepherd Trust Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		<p>The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.</p>	<p>Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.</p>
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	---	---

460	Mr C Reid Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--

463	Mr D White Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--



466	Mssrs Parmenter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	---	---	--------------------------	-----	--	--

467	Mssrs Parmenter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be 'frozen out' of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	---	---	--------------------------	-----	--	--

468	Mrs D Morrall Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--

470	Mr C Hart Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	--

472		Mr M Allard Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
502		Mr Peter Rose	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	4672727	We object to Policy SPL2 " Settlement Development Boundaries and the Map for Stisted which has no available land allocated for any expansion of the village even by 1 dwelling. This representation requests the inclusion of the small 1 acre field in front of the church into the Stisted settlement development boundary. This sites presents a uniquely sustainable option for helping to meet the districts housing need and the plan should therefore be revised to include it as an allocation for residential development.	Include the 1 acre field in front of the church known as Chicken Meadow into the Stisted settlement development boundary.

503	Andrewsfield New Settlement Consortium Agent: Mr David Maxwell GL Hearn	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		OFFICER RESPONSE Paragraph 3.3 of the Local Plan indicates that a new strategic scale garden community will be delivered to the west of Braintree on the border with Uttlesford District. ANSC has worked closely with both Braintree and Uttlesford District Councils to set out a Development Vision that straddles both Braintree and Uttlesford Districts. It is submitted that the level of co-operation and understanding between Braintree and Uttlesford District Councils as well as with ANSC and Galliard Homes provides strong support towards the WBG being a cross-district development according with both the current Braintree Reg. 19 Local Plan, and also the recently published Reg. 18 Uttlesford Local Plan.	
506	Mr Peter Rose	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	4672739	We object to Policy SPL2 " Settlement Development Boundaries and the Map for Stisted which has no available land allocated for any expansion of the village even by 1 dwelling. Previously presented sites STIS 398 and 399 should be included in the Stisted settlement development boundary. These sites presents a uniquely sustainable option for helping to meet the districts housing need and the plan should therefore be revised to include it as an allocation for residential development.	Previously presented sites STIS 398 (site of Rectory Road - opp no 63) and STIS 399 (Land off Back Lane - r/o Brickwall farm) should be included in the Stisted settlement development boundary.
521	Mr Sean Marten Senior Planner David Wilson Homes Eastern Counties Agent: Mr Jonathan Dixon Associate Director Savills	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		It is considered appropriate, in principle, that the spatial strategy to concentrate development on Braintree, planned new garden communities, Witham and the A12 Great Eastern Main Line corridor, and Halstead. In this context it should be recognised that Hatfield Peverel is an identified Key Service Village within the areas where development will be concentrated, with a mainline train station. Despite this, the Consultation Document proposes the allocation at Hatfield Peverel of just two sites for new dwellings over the next 15 years. This approach is considered unjustified and inconsistent with National Policy as Paragraph 47 of the NPPF provides that local plans have a critical role 'to boost significantly the supply of housing'.	In order to adequately deliver the strategic objectives identified in this policy and focus development along the A12 Great Eastern Main Line corridor, more sites in sustainable locations should be allocated for development such as the land east of Gleneagles Way in Hatfield Peverel.
531	Mr Rob Scott M. Scott Properties Agent: Mr Richard Clews Associate Planner Strutt and Parker LLP	No	Question not answered	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Please see above and attached Statement, paragraphs 71-75	Please see attached Statement
535	A Stevenson Agent: Mr Trevor Dodkins Director Phase 2 Planning & Developmen	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		O/S The draft Plan seeks to rely on significant number from strategic sites, there is little potential for early delivery due to site delivery issues and can't be relied on in the short term. A range of sites should be included.	

538	Mr Brian Day Agent: Mr Trevor Dodkins Director Phase 2 Planning & Developmen	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	NPPF para 54 makes clear that LPAs should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs in rural areas. NPPF also empahasises supporting a prosperous rural economy. The spatial strategy should recognise the size, service level, and position of Halstead in the northern part of the district where it can meet housing needs in this area. Apart from Factory Lane West, there are no specific allocations in Halstead over and above existing commitments, and that the emphasis remains on Braintree and Witham. The Local Plan has had to seek to rely on significant numbers of new homes being delivered from strategic growth locations, where there is little potential for early delivery. The spatial strategy should recognise the size, service level, and position of Halstead in the northern part of the district where it can meet housing needs in this area.	
541	Mr J Still Braintree Golf Club Ltd. Agent: Mr Trevor Dodkins Director Phase 2 Planning & Developmen	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	Officer response: Focus on existing settlements is not challenged but level proposed is not a proportionate approach based on meeting needs as close as possible to where they arise as above, and which is based on service provision. Such a strategy should recognise the size, service level, and position of Stisted where it can meet housing needs in this area. Significant numbers of new homes being delivered from strategic growth locations, where there is little potential for early delivery.	
545	Mr Phil Bamford Planning Manager Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	Officer Summary Support growth around existing settlements and its scale dependent on it needs. Diversification of rural economy is important. Best housing delivery strategy is a spread of sites and typologies across a district. Consideration should be given to sites (new garden villages) delivering in the medium term (5 " 10 years), of scale 1,000 " 1,500 dwellings and adjacent to areas with existing infrastructure. Such sites would lie between small sites and Garden Settlements. Without such sites there will be a problem in delivering for housing needs and therefor inconsistent with National policy, unjustified, ineffective and unsound.	
557	Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	Last paragraph to have the caveat!..subject to the West of Braintree option being reviewed as to its need depending upon and coherence with Uttlesfords housing plans for Dunmow and east of Dunmow.
569	Mr Des Dunlop	No	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	Given the need to boost significantly the supply of housing in line with national policy, we submit that the focus on new garden communities is currently too great. D2 Planning considers that a more appropriate strategy would be to support urban expansion across all settlements, at a proportionate level to the scale of the settlement.	Amend Plan as per our representations.

574	The Crown Estate Office Agent: Ms Helena Deaville Amec Foster Wheeler	Question not answered	Question not answered	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	Officer Summary Reword or delete the first paragraph ensure soundness and consistency. It refers to growth being accommodated according to the existing settlement scale and existing role. It should be more positive. The focus on Braintree, A12 corridor Witham Hatfield Peverel, Kelvedon and Feering and new Garden Community set out in 3.3 but is not entirely consistent with the policy. The generic first paragraph in SP2 is contradicts Braintrees specific strategy. Could replace it with locally distinctive text setting spatial strategy for each district. Or cross reference spatial strategy for each district as set out in Section 5.	
586	Arboretum Partners Agent: Ms Kate Kerrigan Principal Planner Boyer Planning	Question not answered	Question not answered	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	It is noted that existing settlements will be the principal focus for additional growth across North Essex, and that the policy includes the re-use of previously developed land within settlements. However, this should not be restricted to settlements only. There are previously developed sites, such as our clients land at Poole Street, Great Yeldham, which meet the sustainable development principles, and can equally assist in providing much needed housing. This accords with the NPPF which encourages the reuse of existing resources and reusing land that has been previously developed. The NPPF does not restrict this to previously development land that is within settlements only. There are also additional opportunities for limited development to come forward within hamlets that would be in keeping with the character of the area and assist in providing much needed housing.	Ensure it is consistent with the NPPF and does not restrict development of PDL to within settlements only.
627	NHS Property Services Ltd NHS Property Services Ltd (NHSPS) Agent: Ms Catherine Williams Associate Savills (UK) Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	We are supportive of the allocation of the site at 8 Collingwood Road as a residential site of 10 or more dwellings, as well as the retention of its location within the Town Centre. However, we believe the comments and amendments suggested above will ensure the Plan is in accordance with the NPPF and will ensure the delivery of much needed new housing in the District. We trust that the above is of assistance in the preparation of the Local Plan. We would like to be kept up to date with progress and look forward to further opportunities to engage. We look forward to confirmation of receipt of these representations. Should you have any queries then please do not hesitate to contact me or my colleague Danniella Persaud (0207 299 3046) of these offices.	PLEASE REFER TO ENCLOSED RESPONSE LETTER
636	Miss Charlotte Self Planner/Assistant Project Manager Kodiak Land	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	Kodiak support the overall strategy of the plan however we do believe that its over-reliance on the delivery of large scale garden communities threatens the deliverability of the overall housing requirement. We would support a spatial strategy that distributes growth more evenly across the district's existing settlements, in addition to the new garden communities, in line with national policy. We also believe that reserve sites should be identified to provide a contingency if the housing requirement is not met.	As detailed in our wider representation



640		Dr Natalie Gates Principal Advisor, Historic Places Team Historic England	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered	Officer Summary SP2 does not refer to the importance of the historic built environment in North Essex. Amend to refer to settlements retaining their distinctive historic character. IT no longer seeks to avoid coalescence between settlements. This is a significant change and has serious implications for conservation and setting of heritage assets especially conservation character. Amend first sentence of paragraph 2 to read œFuture growth will be planned to ensure settlements maintain their distinctive character and role, and to avoid coalescence between them • Previous comments suggested the policy set out what the supporting text means in respect of high quality of built environment for North Essex and this comment still applies.	
	LPPD5	Mr Andrew Martin, Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Support is extended for this approach, which should ensure that the most sustainable settlements in the district accommodate the bulk of the additional growth envisaged in the Local Plan for Tendring.	None.
	LPPD7	Mr Andrew Martin, Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Support is extended for this approach, which should ensure that the most sustainable settlements in the district accommodate the bulk of the additional growth envisaged in the Local Plan for Tendring.	None.
	LPPD12	MR LESLIE SHORT, Artisan PPS Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		[Officer summary] There is an over-reliance and concentration of housing delivery in the Spatial Strategy in the form of new garden village settlements which are often very long in the making and susceptible to delay. A more evenly balanced complementary dispersal policy to include allocations in all lower order but sustainable settlements in the District, should be considered a better alternative.	Allocate additional sites for housing such as land at Centenary Way, Clacton (Foots Farm).
	LPPD21	Mr Andrew Hunter, Planning Advisor - Sustainable Places Team Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		There may be merit in reinforcing the desire to follow Garden City principles by making reference to the principles reflecting the Garden City principles espoused by the Town and Country Planning Association. See for instance "The Art of Building a Garden city: Designing New Communities for the 21st Century".	Make reference to the TCPA Garden City principles.

		LPPD31	Historic Environment Planning Adviser, Historic England	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		The policy refers to Map 3.3 but this is not apparent in the published documents. The policy does not refer to the importance of the historic built environment in North Essex. The Policy no longer seeks to avoid coalescence between settlements which has potentially serious implications for the conservation and setting of heritage assets, especially the character of conservation areas. The supporting text (paras 3.1 to 3.5) should set out what the policy means for North Essex in respect of high quality of built and urban design.	Amend the second paragraph of Policy SP2 to ensure that reference is made to settlements maintaining their distinctive and historic character. Amend the first sentence in the second paragraph to say: Future growth will be planned to ensure settlements maintain their distinctive character and role, and to avoid coalescence between them." Amend the supporting text to set out what the policy means for Essex in respect of high quality of built and urban design.
		LPPD82	Mr Paul Derry, Senior Planner Barton Willmore	No		No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Bloor Homes are supportive of the need for existing settlements to be the principal focus for additional growth across North Essex as noted within Policy SP2.	None.
		LPPD95	Martin Robeson, Martin Robeson Planning Practice	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		[Officer summary] The first sentence of the second paragraph should include reference to the improvement of existing settlements through future growth. The Plan also limits itself unnecessarily to explaining how sustainable development principles can be best applied to achieving the spatial strategy by giving only one such example i.e. through ensuring that development locations are accessible by a choice of means of travel. Ensuring sustainable growth and development has a number of other important principles that can usefully be expressed within such an important policy. We are very concerned about the reference in the supporting text that "The countryside will be protected". The NPPF does not say that the countryside should not be protected for its own sake.	[Officer interpretation] Include reference to improving existing settlements through future growth; do not limit the commentary on sustainable development principles to accessibility matters; and remove reference, in the supporting text, to the countryside being protected.
		LPPD77	Jill Hughes, AM Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Support is extended for this approach, which should ensure that the most sustainable settlements in the district accommodate the bulk of the additional growth envisaged in the Local Plan for Tendring.	None.



6102		Richard Waylen										Accepting the numbers needed are correct, then the plan satisfies the need for homes. Analysis is needed to ensure the right mix especially considering the balance against age profile of areas	
6112		2008 Angora Bare Trusts (Cheffins)										We support the overall level of housing provision	None
6160		The University of Essex (The JTS Partnership)										Whilst it is for the Borough Council to determine the numbers of houses to be provided in the district in the period up to 2033, the University supports the commitment to meeting, in full, objectively assessed need.	None
6208		North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group										To ensure that the NHS is fully engaged in the planning process to ensure health facilities are positioned in an suitable places to enable communities to access healthcare appropriately.	None
6274		Wivenhoe town Council	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	□	A		Colchester should not be a victim of its trend for over-development. Provision must be made for downward adjustment in housing numbers. This scale of growth is unsustainable without a radical re-think of the volume of land to be used for employment. There is no justification in Colchester for applying a market signals uplift to the demographic projection. Unemployment is already high in the area.	The Housing Assessment should account for the exponential growth seen in Colchester in recent years and reflect a more gradual level of growth. It is difficult to see why a market signals uplift from the best guess 484 dwellings to a total of 550 is suggested. ' This scale of growth is unsustainable without a radical re-think of the volume of land to be used for employment.
6344		Wivenhoe Society	yes	yes	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	A		No housing need evidence is provided for the proposed post 2033 growth. No rationale is given for the choice of sites. The West Tendring site will do little to promote growth of Tendring's economy and will effectively be a suburb of Colchester. The possibility of a site further to the east does not appear to have been researched. For the two sites nearest to Colchester there is no discussion as to whether it is sensible to embark on both of these simultaneously. No evidence is provided that a "step change" in sustainable transport is possible.	There should be a downward adjustment in the housing totals for Colchester
6417		CAUSE (Rosie Pearson)	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	A	yes	We set out in detail in appendix 5 (page 40 <a href="http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf">http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf</a> ) why the OAN is too high.  If the unjustified uplifts to the demographic forecasts are dropped then the need for two out of the three garden communities is removed.	Detailed changes are set out in appendix 1. Specifically, Colchester and Braintree should remove their unjustified uplifts to the most recent DCLG demographic forecasts, reducing their OAN to 831 (Colchester) and 624 (Braintree)  Appendix 1 (page 40 <a href="http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf">http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf</a> )

6442		Andrew Martin Planning (representing R F West )	yes	yes	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A		Support for the overall objectively assessed housing need figure for Colchester Borough (920 homes per annum, and a total minimum housing supply of 18,400 in the plan period 2013 - 2033) in Policy SP3, but we object to the trajectory.  Object to some of the housing allocations in the Plan and the degree to which these will meet the five-year housing land supply requirements . The Plan should be revised to include more sites capable of being developed in the early years, to ensure a degree of flexibility eg. Land North of London Road, Stanway and East Marks Tey.	The housing trajectory should be revised to reflect earlier delivery of sites at London Raod, Stanway and land East of Marks Tey.
6462		Peter Chillingworth				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			Agree with the principle of Garden Communities and the inclusion of East Colchester, but not West Tey as being premature.	None.
6487		Andrew Martin Planning (representing Crest Nicholson)	yes	yes	no	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A	yes	The Plan should be revised to include more sites capable of being developed in the early years, to ensure a degree of flexibility. Land at East Marks Tey is well placed to assist in meeting the objectively assessed need for housing in Colchester, including within the first five years of the Plan. It could represent a first phase of the new Garden Community proposed for Marks Tey or be brought forward early in the plan period as a free standing development.	The Plan should be revised to include more sites capable of being developed in the early years, to ensure a degree of flexibility. Land at East Marks Tey is well placed to assist in meeting the objectively assessed need for housing in Colchester, including within the first five years of the Plan. It could represent a first phase of the new Garden Community proposed for Marks Tey or be brought forward early in the plan period as a free standing development (see attached site location plan).
6540		Campaign to Protect Rural Essex	yes	yes	no		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	h		Concern over the proposed location and scale of housing and whether the needs of newly formed households will be met.	Housing should be located near to the strategic economic areas of north Essex including Essex University, Northern Gateway, Skyline 120 and international gateways of Stansted and Harwich. In north Essex, much of the road and rail infrastructure is stretched and a sustainable transport strategy will be essential. Matching housing locations with economic activities is an inherently sustainable approach. Given the fact that predictions are based on historical trends and estimates for future growth, they may have to be revised and indeed possibly reduced in the future to respond to economic and demographic changes. To ensure soundness, flexibility and review points should therefore be built into the Plan.
6741		Mike Lambert	no	no	no	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		h	yes	The Plan fails the test of soundness in terms of being 'Justified' - ie. 'the most appropriate strategy considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence', in relation to the proposed three New Garden Communities (NGCs), and in particular the proposal for up to 24,000 proposed within Policy SP9 for Colchester/Braintree Border Garden Community (CBBGC),	the figure for Colchester should be reduced to 831 and 716 for Braintree as per CAUSE Representations

6793		Marks Tey Parish Council (PJPC Ltd)											MTPC does not seek to dispute the overall housing need figures but notes that the Garden Communities will clearly not be able to make any contribution to delivery until the latter part of the local plan period. As noted elsewhere, on the basis of the lack of clear evidence, the deliverability of these numbers is questioned.	
6847		William Sunnucks	no	no	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	h			Colchester's target of 920 dwellings per annum is not justified by the evidence and not sustainable. It should be reduced to about 831 dpa in line with demographic projections from the DCLG, Planning Practice Guidance and historic delivery over the last 10 years. The difference arises from confusion over whether jobs need houses - they might do in a gold rush town which is sucking in labour, but Colchester is a net exporter of labour. I support CAUSE's response which provides more detail.	The target should be reduced to 831 dpa, which (with similar adjustment by Braintree's) will allow two out of the three garden communities to be dropped.
6907		Persimmon Homes			no		x						Officer summary -Persimmon Homes agree with HBF's analysis (Aug 2017) that based on both increased migration from London and concerns regarding affordability, OAHN are higher and should increase. Not clear from Policy SP3 what actions the Council will take in the event of a persistent under delivery against housing requirements within the plan. Garden communities are very ambitious and there remains significant risk that the timescales for delivery will slip. Actions could include a partial review of the plan and allocation of additional housing sites.	Wording of SP3 should reflect para 47 of the NPPF and as such should be amended to read; 'Each authority will maintain a sufficient supply of deliverable sites sufficient to provide for at least five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer and will work proactively with applicants to bring forward sites that accord with the overall spatial strategy and relevant policies in the plan'. Further changes requested on requiring partial review of plan and allocation of additional housing sites, but no specific wording provided.
7049		Boyer Planning			yes						yes		It is supported that the local authorities will identify sufficient deliverable sites for the plan period, and that each authority will maintain a sufficient supply of deliverable sites to provide for at least five years' worth of housing. Our client is committed to working proactively with the local planning authority to bring their site forward in accordance with the overall spatial strategy and relevant policies in the plan.	

7104		HBF			no	x					Officer summary. Level of delivery underestimates housing need and does not adequately consider increased in migration from London (reflecting the London Plan's migration assumptions that underpin its own assessment of need); does not effectively assess key market signals in relation to Braintree and Colchester; or use ONS data as the starting point for Tendring's Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN).	Based on both increased migration from London and concerns regarding affordability we would suggest the following OANs for each of the three Councils forming part of the "North Essex" area: Braintree – 762 dpa (623 starting point plus 12 units for London migration scenario and a 20% uplift); Colchester – 1002 dpa (866 starting point plus 45 units for London migration scenario and a 10% uplift); Tendring – 776 dpa (675 plus 15% uplift). This level of delivery would require the North Essex HMA to deliver 2540 homes per annum, a total of 50,800 new homes between 2013 and 2033.	
7123		Hopkins Homes (Pegasus Group, Nicky Parsons)	yes	yes	no	✓		✓		h	yes	The table continues to leave the annual requirement as a fixed figure rather than a minimum target which would be consistent with the stated minimum supply across the plan period. The previous request to refer to the annual supply as a minimum target is therefore repeated. It is also noted that the Plan has not been altered to explain how the need arising from London has been addressed. The previous request to address this is also repeated. It is considered that these issues raise doubts about the extent to which the plan is positively prepared and will be effective. It is also noted that the Plan has not been altered to explain how the need arising from London has been addressed. The previous request to address this is repeated. It is considered that these issues raise doubts about the extent to which the plan is positively prepared and will be effective.	Include minimum in the heading of column 2 of the table in policy SP3. Explain how the influence of London has been taken into account in arriving at the housing figures.
7149		Pegasus (Nicky Parsons) on behalf of Bloor Homes Eatern	yes	yes	no	✓		✓		h		It is noted the table continues to leave the annual requirement as a fixed figure rather than a minimum target. A minimum target would be consistent with the stated minimum supply across the plan period. The annual supply figure should therefore be expressed as a minimum target.	* Include 'minimum' in the heading of column 2 of the table in policy SP3. * Explain how the influence of London has been taken into account in arriving at the housing figures.
7161		Gladman Development (Mathieu Evans)	yes	yes	no	✓				h	yes	Gladman object to SP3 in that it fails to identify the full need for housing across the Housing Market Area. Gladman instructed Barton Willmore to prepare a critique of the council's latest housing needs evidence base to assess how robust the study was (appendix 2). To summarise: Maldon should form part of the HMA, disagree with GLA demographic scenario figure, does not make any adjustment to address suppressed household formation, does not provide a consistent approach to assessment of the economic element, 920 dwellings per annum represents an under estimate.	Suggest a figure of 1,039 dwellings per annum for Colchester.

7208		Colchester Hospital Trust				no							Hospital Trust queried housing estimates used in Infrastructure Delivery Plan which could underestimate need for housing and consequential impact on health services.	
7259		Tollgate Partnership (Barton Willmore, Paul Newton)				no			✓		h	yes	The Policy refers to a minimum housing supply over the Plan period 2013-2033, yet the Plan period is understood to be 2017-2033 as referred to at the front of the document. Clarification and consistency is required and the Plan amended accordingly.	as above
7292		Basildon Council (Amanada Parrott)				no	✓		✓		h	no	Section 1 does not include a review mechanism that would enable any unmet housing need arising in other Essex Housing Market Areas to be considered by the north Essex authorities. There is the potential for unmet need to arise from the South Essex Housing Market Area, although the scale is currently being quantified. There is insufficient flexibility in Section 1 as currently written to accommodate consideration of this unmet need at a later date, affecting the extent to which it has been positively prepared and its potential effectiveness.	Inclusion of a review mechanism and introduce more flexibility for enabling unmet housing need within the Essex Housing Market Areas
	61	Mr Mark East	Yes	Yes	No	✓	□	□	□	No			Garden Communities should deliver 40% affordable housing not 30%.	
	3	East of England CoOperative Society East of England Co Operative Society Agent: Miss Paige Harris Boyer Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	□	□	□	□	No	4632142		The East of England Co-operative Society supports the intention to boost the supply of housing and plan positively for housing growth over the Plan period as stated in Section 1 of the Publication Draft Local Plan. It is hoped that the Local Planning Authority (along with Tendring District Council and Colchester Borough Council) will identify sufficient deliverable sites for the respective Plan period.	



48	Mr Stephen Walsh vice chairman Unex Group Holdings Limited Agent: Mr Greg Pearce Senior Planner David Lock Associates	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	4633504	The Unex Group supports the proposed housing target of delivering 716 homes per annum and the minimum net housing supply over the Plan period of 14,320 (2017-2033). Although this is marginally lower than the previous Draft Local Plan (2016) target, the Unex Group remain in support of Policy SP3 as the figures are based on empirical evidence set out in the Objectively Assessed Housing Need Study: November 2016 Update prepared for Braintree, Chelmsford, Colchester and Tendring LPAs. We can therefore conclude that the net additional dwellings target of 716 per annum proposed in the Plan is sound, being based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively assessed needs, is achievable, justified and an appropriate approach to meeting the housing needs of the District. This approach is consistent with bullet point 1 of Paragraph 47 of the NPPF which requires LPAs to identify key sites which will meet the housing needs of the housing area over the Plan period.	
66	Mr John August Galliard Homes Ltd Agent: Mr Martin Herbert WYG	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes			
82	Mr Christopher Bailey Owner Agent: Mr Christopher Bailey Clockhouse Town Planning	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The preparation of the plan starts from the Strategic housing market assessment and the objectively assessed housing needs study. Neither of those documents acknowledges the existing housing crisis. From this point forward, the plan is not based on robust evidence. It is not effective or justified and is not positively planned.	Reject this document in entirety and start over taking account of the existing housing crisis. In particular the need to deliver some 6000 homes his week to meet existing unmet and unsustainable need

111	Mr Paul Gibbs Bellway Homes Ltd Agent: Mr Olivier Spencer Associate Andrew Martin Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Bellway Homes supports the overall objectively assessed housing need figure (i.e. 14,320 dwellings between 2013 and 2033), for Braintree District, set out in Policy SP3. This is consistent with Braintree District Councils (BDCs) latest evidence base. It is also noteworthy that the second paragraph in Policy SP3 expects each local authority to maintain a sufficient supply of deliverable sites to provide for at least five years worth of housing, consistent with paragraph 47 of the NPPF. However, subsequent parts of the Braintree Local Plan Publication Draft and in particular Policy LPP17 and Appendix 1 fail to do this. This matter is addressed further in separate representations made to Policy LPP17 in Section 2 of the Braintree Local Plan Publication Draft.	Bellway Homes supports the overall objectively assessed housing need figure (i.e. 14,320 dwellings between 2013 and 2033), for Braintree District, set out in Policy SP3. This is consistent with Braintree District Councils (BDCs) latest evidence base. It is also noteworthy that the second paragraph in Policy SP3 expects each local authority to maintain a sufficient supply of deliverable sites to provide for at least five years worth of housing, consistent with paragraph 47 of the NPPF. However, subsequent parts of the Braintree Local Plan Publication Draft and in particular Policy LPP17 and Appendix 1 fail to do this. This matter is addressed further in separate representations made to Policy LPP17 in Section 2 of the Braintree Local Plan Publication Draft.
148	William Lee Agent: Anna Bend Amec Foster Wheeler	Yes	Yes	No	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	Yes	4633840	Amec Foster Wheeler Environment and Infrastructure UK Limited (Amec Foster Wheeler) has been instructed by W.G.Lee to submit representations to the above consultation. These representations are submitted in respect of land at and adjoining the East Essex Hunt Kennels, Earls Colne, as shown on Site Location Plan 39345-Lea04. Representations have previously been made in respect of these sites to the Site Allocations Development Plan Document as alternatives EAR7Halt and EAR10 HAIt. It is questionable whether the Council is planning for a sufficient level of housing to meet the objectively assessed needs and enable appropriate growth within the District. As such, further sites should be allocated for development for the Plan to be found sound.	
166	Bovis Homes Ltd Agent: Mr Leslie Short Director Artisan Planning & Property ServicesS	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		We support the level of growth indicated for Braintree as a measure of meeting the FOAN in the District but hope that it is a minimum requirement. We also support the policy initiative to work proactively with applicants to bring forward sites that accord with the overall spatial strategy and relevant policies in the plan, but consider that there should be the wider/most flexible interpretation of that policy to facilitate the event that the spatial strategy policy SP2 and its reliance on a massive allocation of the new homes requirement in three concentrated locations (garden villages) fails or falters.	

173		Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Post Brexit who is to say these figures are still required. These housing targets are based around 2015 figures. ONS since the Brexit vote have been monitoring migration through every exit point in the UK. Figures of people are going up. New figures need to be obtained	
185		Bellway Homes Limited - Strategic Growth Agent: Mr Andrew Martin Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Support is extended for the overall objectively assessed housing need figure (i.e. 14,320 dwellings between 2013 and 2033), for Braintree District, set out in Policy SP3. This is consistent with Braintree District Councils (BDCs) latest evidence base. It is also noteworthy that the second paragraph in Policy SP3 expects each local authority to maintain a sufficient supply of deliverable sites to provide for at least five years worth of housing, consistent with paragraph 47 of the NPPF. However, subsequent parts of the Braintree Local Plan Publication Draft and in particular Policy LPP17 and Appendix 1 fail to do this. This matter is addressed further in separate representations made to Policy LPP17 in Section 2 of the Braintree Local Plan Publication Draft.	n/a
204		Mr Daniel Worth	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Point 4.4 states " Demographic projections are the starting point for assessing how much housing will be required across an area. Based on 2014 national projections..." - these projections were made before the vote for Brexit? Have these figures been altered/re-calculated in response to Brexit? This need clarification.	
209		Mr Peter Williams Director Williams Group Agent: Mrs Teresa Cook Principal Consultant Emery Planning Partnership Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		4634363	The plan cannot be found sound unless the Council can demonstrate a deliverable five year supply. It has not been positively prepared. The plan should not be submitted until the Council can robustly demonstrate a deliverable five year supply. The PDLP states that the plan has identified a potential supply for the plan period of 10% of homes over the requirement, we consider that the flexibility should be increased to at least 20%.	

227	Mr Stuart McAdam	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	Persimmon Homes strongly suggest Braintree is at risk of not being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply during in the course of the plan period and the delivery of sufficient housing within the overall Plan period. The Draft Local Plan does not: -adequately consider increased migration from London - impact of London not meeting its own housing need - Effectively assess key market signals In order to future proof the plan, it is suggested that the Council should seek to allocate reserved sites which can be brought forward if Braintree see an increase in their housing needs	As detailed above, the garden community is very ambitious and there remains significant risk that the timescales for delivery will slip. In the event of persistent under delivery, the Local Plan should set out what actions they shall take. Actions could include a partial review of the plan and allocation of additional housing sites.
257	Mssrs Piers von Berg & William Ripper Agent: Mr David Butcher WYG	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Policy SP3 seeks to apply total minimum housing supply figures to Braintree, Colchester and Tendring. Use of the words "Total Minimum" suggests that development beyond the numbers proposed will be acceptable, provided it accords with the other Local Plan policies or material considerations weigh in favour of permitting it. However, the words "Total Minimum" are not defined within the text of the Local Plan and are therefore unclear.	Define the term broadly to allow for additional housing to come forward where justified.
284	Braintree South Alliance Agent: Mrs Gabrielle Rowan Associate Pegasus Planning Group	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered	Policy SP 3 relates to meeting housing needs in the Local Authority areas making up the North Essex Housing Market Area. It sets out Braintree's Objectively Assessed Need for housing per annum (716 dwellings) and its total minimum housing supply in the plan period 2013-2033 (14,320 dwellings), requirements which are to be met through the identification of sufficient deliverable sites or broad locations by the Council. This policy is supported, the OAN is based on latest 2014 national projections and it is considered that the land to the east of Great Notley proposed allocation, which is a deliverable site, will make a valuable contribution to meeting the Council's identified housing requirement in terms of supply.	
514	Mr Chris Gatland SEE AGENT DETAILS Agent: Mr Tom Davies Planning Potential	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Summary As stated above, Redrow support the principles put forward in the Local Plan in general and the continued allocation of the Rayne Lodge site for residential development, and particular the minimum housing target as specified in LPP17, as this is consistent with Paragraph 47 of the NPPF which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing.	

518	William Lee Agent: Anna Bend Amec Foster Wheeler	Yes	Yes	No	✓	☐	✓	✓	Yes	4687260	OFFICER RESPONSE: BDC cannot meet it's OAN and should allocate more housing at Earls Colne.	That the settlement boundary for Earls Colne is amended to include the Morleys Road site, as demonstrated on Plan 39384-Lea17-A4L.
520	Mr Sean Marten Senior Planner David Wilson Homes Eastern Counties Agent: Mr Jonathan Dixon Associate Director Savills	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		OFFICER RESPONSE Braintree is expected to contribute 716 dwellings per annum towards the cumulative total - it is concerning that this figure has been reduced from that previously proposed. Given the increased level of unaffordability in Braintree District, there is a clear justification for increasing the housing requirement to address the issue of affordability. We do not consider that the housing numbers cited in Policy SP 3 would significantly boost supply and therefore would not address either the existing shortfall or future housing needs in accordance with national policy.	This policy should be amended to increase the housing requirement and address the issue of affordability, which currently exclude members of the community from the housing market. The Council should allocate a number of smaller sites in Key Service Villages such as Hatfield Peveral which have the infrastructure and therefore the ability to support further development.
527	Mr Rob Snowling Pigeon Investment Management Ltd	Question not answered	Question not answered	No	☐	✓	☐	☐	Yes		The Draft Local Plan seeks to meet housing need which has been identified through an objective assessment of housing need within the housing market area, produced jointly with neighbouring authorities within the same housing market. This approach aligns with Government guidance set out in the Planning Practice Guidance and is supported in principle. However, we are concerned that the Council has not adequately assessed its full OAHN and this could lead to the lack of housing supply being intensified due to: (i) not fully considering increased migration from London; (ii) not adequately assessing market signals; and (iii) not using ONS data as the starting point for calculating Tendring's OAHN.	Please see accompanying statement.
532	Mr Rob Scott M. Scott Properties Agent: Mr Richard Clews Associate Planner Strutt and Parker LLP	No	Question not answered	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		Please see above and attached Statement, paragraphs 71-75	Please see attached Statement

536	A Stevenson Agent: Mr Trevor Dodkins Director Phase 2 Planning & Developmen	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		With regard to draft policy SP3 (previously SP2 in the Draft Local Plan 2016), we note that the proposed minimum net additional homes in Braintree, although having dropped marginally (minus 45 units) is still represented as a minimum number and this is supported. However, we would still stress that there is some discordancy within the Plan relating to housing delivery as set out above, and the reliance on larger garden communities when a balanced approach including a range of site size and delivery programmes may ensure earlier delivery contributing to increase the present five year deficit.	
539	Mr Brian Day Agent: Mr Trevor Dodkins Director Phase 2 Planning & Developmen	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		O/S -As a consequence, with regard to draft policy SP3, we support the proposed net additional homes in the Plan period and the reference to the fact that this is a minimum. However, we would stress that the reliance on larger garden communities when a balanced approach including a range of site size and delivery programmes may ensure earlier delivery contributing to increase the present five year deficit.	
542	Mr J Still Braintree Golf Club Ltd. Agent: Mr Trevor Dodkins Director Phase 2 Planning & Developmen	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		O/S - Large strategic housing sites will not deliver houses quickly enough. A range of site sizes should be included, to ensure home delivery.	
543	Godden & Godden Agent: Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	4691439	The Village can accommodate further growth with careful planning whilst retaining its distinctive character. The NW site proposed for 100 units of which 50% Specialist Housing, was assessed in the Landscape Analysis Study as having the highest capacity of all adjoining the Settlement to accommodate development, yet the Council has not considered allocating the land. Permissions have been given recently on the same capacity land eg EARC221 and EAR3H, and EARC225 subject to s.106. The SE site proposed is brown-field for sequential preference. The same Study identifies the opportunity to create a cluster of development based on the farmstead and elements of commercial activity, to soften the harsh urban edges to the north, and to establish green links between the west of the settlement and the Nature Reserve. The landowner is also offering to connect the footpaths all the way to Bourne Brook to the West.	Requested Change That the settlement boundary for Earls Colne is amended to include both the sites at Hay House Farm, as demonstrated on Inset Plan 21, with 50% of the area of the NW site being allocated a Specialist Housing site to accord with Policy LPP 26.

570		Mr Des Dunlop	No	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		D2 Planning are concerned that there is no certain contingency to respond to changing circumstances, especially when the Local Plan is relying on difficult to deliver strategic sites.	Amend Plan as per our representations.
573		The Crown Estate Office Agent: Ms Helena Deaville Amec Foster Wheeler	Question not answered	Question not answered	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes			
583		Mr James Stevens Home Builders Federation	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		O/S - we are concerned that this figure does not: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequately consider increased in migration from London</li> <li>• Effectively assess key market signals in relation to Braintree and Colchester</li> <li>• Use ONS data as the starting point for Tendring's Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN).</li> </ul>	Based on both increased migration from London and concerns regarding affordability we would suggest the following OANs for each of the three Councils forming part of the North Essex area: Braintree " 762 dpa (623 starting point plus 12 units for London migration scenario and a 20% uplift) Colchester " 1002 dpa (866 starting point plus 45 units for London migration scenario and a 10% uplift) Tendring " 776 dpa (675 plus 15% uplift) This level of delivery would require the North Essex HMA to deliver 2540 homes per annum, a total of 50,800 new homes between 2013 and 2033.
587		Arboretum Partners Agent: Ms Kate Kerrigan Principal Planner Boyer Planning	Question not answered	Question not answered	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		It is noted the objectively assessed need for housing identified for Braintree is 716 per annum, and that each authority will maintain a sufficient supply of deliverable sites to provide for at least five years worth of housing. However, given Braintree cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, and there has been a backlog in housing provision, it is not clear that this backlog will be addressed as part of the 5 year housing land supply moving forward. This is discussed further under our representations for Section 2 and Policy LPP 17.	

631		NHS Property Services Ltd NHS Property Services Ltd (NHSPS) Agent: Ms Catherine Williams Associate Savills (UK) Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		We are supportive of the allocation of the site at 8 Collingwood Road as a residential site of 10 or more dwellings, as well as the retention of its location within the Town Centre. However, we believe the comments and amendments suggested above will ensure the Plan is in accordance with the NPPF and will ensure the delivery of much needed new housing in the District. We trust that the above is of assistance in the preparation of the Local Plan. We would like to be kept up to date with progress and look forward to further opportunities to engage. We look forward to confirmation of receipt of these representations. Should you have any queries then please do not hesitate to contact me or my colleague Danniella Persaud (0207 299 3046) of these offices.	PLEASE REFER TO ENCLOSED RESPONSE LETTER
637		Miss Charlotte Self Planner/Assistant Project Manager Kodiak Land	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		Kodiak support the overall strategy of the plan however we do believe that its over-reliance on the delivery of large scale garden communities threatens the deliverability of the overall housing requirement. We would support a spatial strategy that distributes growth more evenly across the district's existing settlements, in addition to the new garden communities, in line with national policy. We also believe that reserve sites should be identified to provide a contingency if the housing requirement is not met.	As detailed in our wider representation
659		Mr Matthew Winslow Planning Policy Manager Basildon Borough Council	Yes	Yes	No	✓	☐	✓	☐	Yes		Section 1 does not include a review mechanism that would enable any unmet housing need arising in other Essex Housing Market Areas to be considered by the north Essex authorities. There is the potential for unmet need to arise from the South Essex Housing Market Area, although the scale is currently being quantified. There is insufficient flexibility in Section 1 as currently written to accommodate consideration of this unmet need at a later date, affecting the extent to which it has been positively prepared and its potential effectiveness.	
	LPPD8	Mr Andrew Martin, Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	Yes							Support is extended for the overall objectively assessed housing need figure (ie. 11,000 dwellings between 2013 and 2033), for Tendring District, set out in Policy SP3. This is consistent with Tendring District Council's evidence base. It is also noteworthy	None.



		LPPD14	MR LESLIE SHORT, Artisan PPS Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓			[Officer summary] We support the level of growth indicated for Tendring but hope that it is a minimum requirement. We also support the policy initiative to work proactively with applicants to bring forward sites that accord with the overall spatial strategy and relevant policies in the plan, but consider that there should be the wider/most flexible interpretation of that policy to facilitate the event that the spatial strategy policy SP2 and its reliance on a massive allocation of the new homes requirement in three concentrated locations fails or falters.	[Officer interpretation] None, so long as the policy is applied flexibly.
		LPPD41	Mr Geoff Armstrong, Armstrong Rigg	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓			[Officer summary] The housing requirement for Tendring should be 15,520 new homes (776 per annum). The Council's decision to reduce the starting point for calculating Tendring's OAHN based on Unattributable Population Change (UPC) is not justified - particularly in light of the Office for National Statistics decision to not make any adjustment to the 2012 or 2014-based Sub-National Population Projections (SNPP) to account for UPC. In reducing the starting point for their OAHN based on UPC, the Council ignores the Government's official published projections in the 2014 SNPP of 675 dwellings per annum, which accounting for the 15% uplift applied by the Council to populations projections gives an OAHN of 776 dwellings per annum or 15,520 dwellings across the plan period.	[Officer interpretation] Policy SP3 and Policy LP1 should be amended to require 15,520 new homes in Tendring District over the plan period, or 776 new homes per annum, and additional sites should be found to accommodate this housing growth.
		LPPD44	Mr Mark Behrendt	Yes	Yes	No		✓					Officer summary. Level of delivery underestimates housing need and does not adequately consider increased in migration from London (reflecting the London Plan's migration assumptions that underpin its own assessment of need); does not effectively assess key market signals in relation to Braintree and Colchester; or use ONS data as the starting point for Tendring's Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN).	[Officer interpretation] Based on both increased migration from London and concerns regarding affordability we would suggest the following OANs for each of the three Councils forming part of the "North Essex" area: Braintree – 762 dpa (623 starting point plus 12 units for London migration scenario and a 20% uplift); Colchester – 1002 dpa (866 starting point plus 45 units for London migration scenario and a 10% uplift); Tendring – 776 dpa (675 plus 15% uplift)

		LPPD55	Catherine Pollard, Boyer Planning	Yes	Yes	No	✓						[Officer summary] The OAHN Study recommends a range of 500-600 dpa for Tendring, adopting 550 dpa as the target where a single number was needed. We are concerned that the level of delivery set within the plan, of 550 dpa, underestimates housing need for the area, and that the higher figure of 600 dwellings per annum should be targeted. Growth at Weeley and Weeley Heath could be more appropriately achieved through the allocation of enhanced levels of growth spread more consistently across Weeley and to include Weeley Heath, in view of its existing levels of access to community facilities, and in a manner which avoids such a large extension into the open countryside.	[Officer interpretation] Increase the Tendring figure to 600 dwellings per annum and consider additional housing allocations in the Weeley and Weeley Heath area.
		LPPD56	Libby Hindle, Boyer Planning	Yes	Yes	No	✓						[Officer summary] The OAHN Study recommends a range of 500-600 dpa for Tendring, adopting 550 dpa as the target where a single number was needed. We are concerned that the level of delivery set within the plan, of 550 dpa, underestimates housing need for the area, and that the higher figure of 600 dwellings per annum should be targeted. Land at Great Bentley is available for development.	[Officer interpretation] Increase the Tendring figure to 600 dwellings per annum and consider additional housing allocations at Great Bentley (such as land east of Plough Road).
		LPPD92	Mr Nick Harper, Managing Director Hawkspur Ltd	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓			[Officer summary] Based on the 2014 Sub-National Population Projections, Tendring's figure should be 15,520 (776 per annum). The predicted delivery from the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community of 2,500 new homes (1,250 in Tendring and 1,250 in Colchester) during the plan period is far too optimistic. Based on industry averages the Council can only realistically expect 1,000 homes (500 in Tendring and 500 in Colchester) to be delivered on this site during the plan period leaving a further shortfall of 750 additional new homes to plan for in the emerging Local Plan.	[Officer interpretation] Increase the housing requirement figure for Tendring in Policy SP3 to 15,520 to reflect the 2014 sub-national population projections. Increase the allocation of land for housing to reflect this higher figure and a potential shortfall of 750 homes arising from under-delivery at the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community.
		LPPD74	Richard Clews, Associate Planner Strutt and Parker	Response withheld	Response withheld	No	✓	✓	✓	✓			[Officer summary] Household projections from CLG indicate a household growth of 12,280 dwellings will be needed in Tendring between 2013-2033. The proposed housing development should be increased and additional sites should be identified in sustainable locations to meet the full requirement. Based on these higher figures Tendring can, at best, only identify a 3.4 year supply of land for housing. The Council is failing to deliver the homes that are needed. Policies SP3 and LP1 should be amended to increase the housing supply accordingly.	[Officer interpretation] Increase the Tendring figure to 12,280 homes and identify sustainable locations to meet the higher requirement, such as land south of Centenary Way, Clacton.

		LPPD83	Mr Paul Derry, Senior Planner Barton Willmore	No		No	✓	✓						[Officer summary] Tendring Members have sought to argue a lower housing figure without substantive evidence and largely for political expediency. The process of how the Council arrived at its figure (detailed in our representation) was contrived. The calculation for housing need in Tendring is complicated by uncertainty arising from 'unattributable population change' (UPC) but the Council proceeds with the figure of 550 dpa despite warnings from Peter Brett Associates that the figure was subject to error. The reduced figure is based on past housing delivery rates which is unsound and not positively prepared.	[Officer interpretation] Apply a figure of 675 dwellings per annum to Tendring plus an appropriate uplift.
		LPPD84	Mr Paul Derry, Senior Planner Barton Willmore	No		No	✓	✓	✓					[Officer summary] There are a lot of unknowns moving forward with this project, and these uncertainties combined with the normal lead in times for such projects raise significant levels of uncertainty as to whether the numbers can be delivered within the allotted timescale, particularly with its location, infrastructure and environmental constraints. There is also an inconsistency between the Garden Community location map and the supporting Policies Map 1 West Tendring, which do not correlate in terms of the location of the Garden Community. As such, we do not believe that the plan is sound by reason that it is not effective or positively planned and that the housing trajectory is not deliverable over the plan period. It is therefore considered the Council will require such smaller sites in order to meet the OAHN, such as land at Rush Green Road, Clacton.	[Officer interpretation] Allocate more smaller sites for housing, such as the land at Rush Green Road, Clacton.
		LPPD59	Mr Matthew Utting, Director MatPlan Limited	Yes	Yes	No								[Officer summary] Policy SP3 sets the requirement of 11,000 homes in Tendring, but Policy LP1 of the Tendring Local Plan then commits to deliver a minimum of 12,001 net additional dwellings between 2013 and 2033, from a variety of sources. As such, it is clear that in order for this policy requirement to be met, it will be necessary to deliver 600 dwellings per year throughout the District. In order to provide clarity and consistency, Policy SP3 should be revised to align with Policy LP1, to commit to deliver a minimum of 12,001 dwellings between 2013 and 2033, at a rate of 600 dwellings per year.	[Officer interpretation] Increase the housing requirement figure for Tendring in Policy SP3 to 12,001 to reflect the housing supply figure contained within Policy LP1.

		LPPD78	Jill Hughes, AM Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes							Support is extended for the overall objectively assessed housing need figure (i.e. 11,000 dwellings between 2013 and 2033), for Tendring District, set out in Policy SP3. This is consistent with the evidence base. The second paragraph in Policy SP3 expects each local authority to maintain a sufficient supply of deliverable sites to provide for at least five years worth of housing, consistent with paragraph 47 of the NPPF. However, subsequent parts of the Tendring Local Plan Publication Draft and in particular Policy LP 1 (and supporting evidence base) fail to do this.	None.
		LPPD87	Phil Bamford, Gladman	Yes	Yes	No	✓						[Officer summary] The correct demographic starting point for Tendring should be 674 dwellings per annum. No consideration has been made within the Housing Needs Update Report of alternative migration trends for Tendring whereas for Braintree, Colchester and Chelmsford alternative trends have been considered. The figures underestimate the effect of migration out of London. Tendring's adjustment for Unattributable Population Change (UPC) is flawed and the evidence should have given greater consideration to economic forecasts, unemployment, commuting and economic activity rates. 550 dwellings per annum represents an under estimate of the level of housing need for Tendring. The true level of housing need in Tendring is between 674 and 972 dwellings per annum.	[Officer interpretation] Apply a figure of between 674 and 974 dwellings per annum to Tendring.
		LPPD98	Matthew Parsons, Persimmon Homes	Yes	Yes	Yes							[Officer summary] Policy SP3 above does not mention that the five-year requirement should be judged against the housing requirement within the Local Plan or that there needs to be an appropriate buffer (i.e. 5% or 20%). The wording of SP3 should reflect para 47 of the NPPF and as such should be amended. It is also not clear what actions the Council will take in the event of a persistent under delivery against housing requirements within the plan. The garden community is very ambitious and there remains significant risk that the timescales for delivery will slip. In the event of persistent under delivery, the Local Plan should set out what actions they shall take. Actions could include a partial review of the plan and allocation of additional housing sites.	[officer interpretation] Amend the wording of Policy SP3 to say: "Each authority will maintain a sufficient supply of deliverable sites sufficient to provide for at least five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer and will work proactively with applicants to bring forward sites that accord with the overall spatial strategy and relevant policies in the plan". Also indicate the actions the aithorities will take in the event of under-delivery.

**LPA response:** Calculation of Objectively Assessed Housing Need - Given the policy, comments here obviously consider the Objectively Assessed Need figures for the three authorities. Working together in a Strategic Housing Market Area with Chelmsford, the Councils methodology for calculating OAN is set out in evidence base documents. This includes taking into account issues that have been raised in responses, including migration, London and affordability. In general these comments suggest that the OAN figure should be increased to take account of these additional factors. Conversely several representatives contend the figure is too high and should be reduced. In the case of CAUSE this is stated because of the unnecessary uplifts made to the demographic starting point of housing need. The Council consider that national guidance and caselaw is clear that these uplifts are not voluntary and must be driven by evidence. The Council methodology and analysis of these uplifts is set out in the evidence base and can be discussed at the examination. This also applies to the methodology set out in relation to the UPC adjustments made for Tendring. Three authorities are working on an agreed approach to deal with approaches from neighbouring authorities once the Local Plan has been adopted, in line with national guidance. The Councils have proposed a minor modification referencing the need for housing reviews to consider other authorities' unmet housing need. Aside from this minor modification, no other changes are considered necessary to SP3.

CBC rep ID	BD C rep ID	TDC rep ID	Name, Organisation	Legally compliant	Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/ written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan
<b>Policy SP4</b>														
6103			Richard Waylen										The need for employment is sound, but the plan does not consider that a significant proportion of the current working population commute to London, If employment is to be addressed it needs to be high quality rather than just retail	
6161			The University of Essex (The JTS Partnership)										The University considers that it is for the Borough to determine the exact level of new land, and jobs, needed to achieve these objectives, but it does note, welcomes, and supports, the acknowledgement (para 5.10) that the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community, has significant potential to deliver both residential and employment opportunities. The University looks forward to working with Colchester and Tendring Councils to help realise the potential of this strategic commitment, particularly in terms of the opportunities that it opens up for new technology based businesses associated with the University itself.	None

6277		Wivenhoe Town Council	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓		A		<p>The prime objective to strengthen and diversify local economies to provide more jobs is not addressed effectively by this plan. The reliance on the creation of a garden community to generate jobs does not focus on the key drivers that encourage businesses and start-ups to locate in an area but extrapolate job creation on the basis of the number of households and the theoretical composition of a garden community is not a plan for generating employment.</p> <p>The base assumption of Colchester's assets and position as a port hinterland is incorrect which also detracts from the soundness of the plan.</p>	<p>More employment land needs to be added.</p> <p>There must be a genuine move to create jobs locally.</p> <p>A great deal more than 17% needs to be for local needs.</p> <p>A mechanism to reduce future dwelling numbers based on the ability of the site to create local jobs must be factored in.</p> <p>This should not be building for the sake of it and garden community principles must be upheld.</p>
6326		Richard Gore										<p>Higher paid jobs for those presently living in the area. There are enough people in the area already to try and attract higher paid jobs. If Colchester can't attract higher paid jobs now another 20,000 people into Colchester won't change the "economies of scale" for employers or the mind set of new employers attracted to the area. When an administrator from London is told she has to "Dumb Down" her CV as the Employers in Colchester would think she was over qualified you know local employment needs looking at before any more development</p>	None
6362		Sean Pordham	yes	no	no	✓	✓	✓		w		<p>The plan does not give any tangible evidence how employment in the new Garden communities will be realised just allocating space will not realise high quality skilled jobs. It also does not state what will happen if the employment is not realised i.e. will houses still be built?</p>	<p>The plan does not give any tangible evidence how employment in the new Garden communities will be realised just allocating space will not realise high quality skilled jobs. It also does not state what will happen if the employment is not realised i.e. will houses still be built?</p>
6418		CAUSE (Rosie Pearson)	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	A	yes	<p>Colchester/Braintree borders will not be able to meet the Garden Communities charter goal of one job per household or nearby. See detailed response in appendix 6, providing for employment, on page 50: <a href="http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf">http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf</a></p>	As before
6443		Andrew Martin (representing R F West)	yes	yes	yes		✓	✓				<p>A key objective for the Colchester Plan is to strengthen and diversify local economies to provide more jobs and achieve a better balance between the location of jobs and housing, which will reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable growth.</p> <p>Major strategic allocations on land North of London Road, Stanway, and a large free standing strategic growth opportunity at East Marks Tey would achieve this objective and create benefits in both the short or longer terms from the positive spin-offs associated with the wider Garden Community.</p>	

6488		Andrew Martin (representing Crest Nicholson)											The Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community will create employment opportunities in terms of its construction and spin-offs, new technology based businesses and will be within easy access to employment opportunities in Colchester. A large free standing growth opportunity East Marks Tey would also benefit in the same way.	
6546		Campaign to Protect Rural Essex	yes	yes	no		✓	✓		h			Concern that employment land provision at stand alone garden communities will not necessarily attract the required level of investment and jobs (in the growth sectors) and that the loss of high grade agricultural land will impact adversely on a locally important sector.	A sustainable economic base and the provision of business and employment opportunities are essential in order to create sustainable communities. A prosperous local economy with a wide range of employment opportunities encourages people to remain in their communities. The economic strategy for north Essex needs to reduce out-commuting by focusing on the local economy - the ports, creative industries in Colchester and the two main drivers of employment - ie the University of Essex (2,000 net jobs forecast) and Stansted (20,000 net jobs forecast). The economic multiplier effects of the University and Stansted are hugely significant for the whole of north Essex. Master-planned urban extensions, which make use of existing infrastructure and economic activity, are more sustainable and viable. This all supports the view that new settlements should be located as an urban extension to the east of Colchester and near to Stansted airport, where there are credible sources of local employment growth. There is no existing employment focus at Marks Tey and, being located at some distance from north Essex's allocated strategic economic areas and town centres, a new community located here will be an exporter of labour.
6742		Mike Lambert	no	no	no		✓	✓	✓	h			The expectation on employment growth are ambitious not but supported by the evidence	The policy needs amending to ensure that whilst flexibility is retained to changing demands in the commercial market, there is not an oversupply of land based on an unrealistic assumption about job growth.
6794		Marks Tey Parish Council (PJPC Ltd)	yes	no	yes			✓	✓	h			A clear commitment to the delivery of employment at every phase should be given to achieve sustainable development and communities. Specific provision for live / work, starter units and other innovative employment provision should be included, within the first LP period, and the expansion of the Anderson / nurseries site could assist in this purpose.	Include reference to live / work units, business start up units and other innovative approaches; require provision in first phases and / or reference to Andersons / nurseries site

6835		William Sunnucks	No	No	Yes	✓	✓	✓	h	<p>The Plan shows little understanding of how real jobs are created. It over-centralises employment in large employment zones, rather than letting the economy breathe. It fails to link housing to local jobs as required by the NPPF. It locates large scale housing at West Tey where house prices will be driven by commuters and be unaffordable to people on local salaries. I support CAUSE's response.</p>	<p>Please explain why Colchester is expected to generate nearly twice the number of jobs of Braintree and Tendring and why different forecasts are used by different Councils (Experian and EEFM)</p> <p>Please say more about the growth of the university from 15000 to 24000 students and its role in creating jobs both directly and indirectly.</p> <p>Please include a map indicating broadly where the required employment land is to be provided.</p> <p>* At present it is spread over 38 "part 2" maps;</p> <p>* There is no definition of the employment land to be contributed as part of the garden communities.</p> <p>Please explain how the 40-60 hectares of retail and leisure land for West Tey (per AECOM/Hyas) will complement rather than undermine the centres of Colchester and Braintree</p> <p>Please highlight the contribution which can be made by brownfield sites (including farmsteads) and smaller locations.</p> <p>* I fear that the plan over-centralises provision of employment land thus creating longer journeys to work and starving the growth of smaller centres. More jobs growth can be achieved by expanding existing brownfield locations rather than zoning large greenfield areas for unspecified growth.</p>
6868		Martin Robeson			no	✓	✓	✓	h	<p>Within Section 1 of the Plan, there is no evidence for why a "higher growth scenario" should be considered, what it is based on or its methodology. Applying such a higher growth scenario simply overflates an already inflated figure of need and would result in identifying land for employment development that will not come forward.</p>	<p>The Plan should make clear that the focus should also be on making the relevant districts attractive to inward investment, in that regard and in other respects securing economic success and performance across diverse sectors. Whilst the policy relates to the provision for Employment and Retail, nowhere in the policy are retail needs considered, assessed or planned for.</p>
7024		Andrew Granger & Co. (Mr Adam Murray)								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support the flexible approach.</li> <li>-Support the flexibility demonstrated in relation to the quantum of development across the plan period through the use of baseline and higher growth scenarios.</li> <li>-In order to ensure the plan has a robust approach towards the provision of employment and retail land, we believe that it is important for the policy to clarify that the <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- baseline development levels are a minimum requirement.</li> <li>-This will ensure the level of employment and retail development that is necessary for projected population growth.</li> </ul> </li> <li>-We consider that land at Place Farm, to be capable of delivering 2.3ha of employment land.</li> </ul>	<p>2430/JF/NT20170912 Changes suggested to the Local Plan Submission Version</p>



7037		Cushman and Wakefield													ye s	We note that Policy SP\$ seeks to identify base positions for identifying the need to provide for employment and Retail, However all of the statistics / requirements relate principally to 'B' Class uses. We suggest that the Policy / supporting paragraphs are extended to include anticipated retail growth or that retail is deleted from this Policy heading and dealt with elsewhere.	In terms of the requirements for Employment Land it is wholly unacceptable that the future of these three districts are being planned on the basis of such wide differentials between the two scenarios.
7153		Pegasus (Nicky Parsons) fir Bloor Homes Eastern	yes	yes	no		✓									Section5 - Providing for Employment (logged against SP4 but relates to explanatory text before policy)This section should be amended to include reference to sources of employment in London. The Plan rightly refers to the excellent connections between Colchester and London and also acknowledges that residents travel outside of the HMA to work at Stansted Airport. The previous draft of the Plan acknowledged that residents commute out to London but this is not reflected in the Plan. The absence of this raises doubts about the justification of the Plan.	Whilst the policy relates to the provision for Employment and Retail, nowhere in the policy are retail needs considered, assessed or planned for.
7260		Tollgate Partnership (Barton Willmore, Paul Newton)			no	✓	✓	✓	✓	h					ye s	The Policy title is confusing as there is no mention of provision for retail floorspace within it. The Policy should be amended accordingly. In addition, (and noting the comments in relation to the Plan Period as set out in respect of Policy SP3), B Class employment land needs are referred to over the period 2016-2033. Again, a consistent basis needs to be adopted, particularly as there can be expected to be an alignment between job and housing growth. We comment on the employment requirement for Colchester in respect of Policy SG3. Policy SP4 should then be amended accordingly.	as above
	8	Mr Chris Board Planner/Project Manager Lanswood Ltd	No	No	No		□	✓	□	□	No					I refer to our submission of 25th May 2016 in respect of employment provision and allocation for FEER227. The submission remains unresponded on the part of the LPA. The submission detail reported to Members prior to the issue of the draft local plan was incorrect and fundamentally flawed in its drafting, this error contributes to the unsound approach of the local plan in respect of employment provision. It remains Lanswood's position that the exclusion of FEER227 fails to consider the NPPF with the duty to cooperate failing to be met with the lack of bespoke and specific response.	

							<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		O/S - Houses before infrastructure, loss of countryside, too much social housing, better quality housing and business, decline in living and environmental standards, improvements to transport, health and education, no support from local electorate.	
	20		Mr Peter Conlon	Yes	Yes	Yes								
	25		Mr Howard Phillips	No	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No		O/S - North Essex well placed in terms of transport, west of Braintree not well served by transport. Potential problems for junction 8 M11 with growth from Stansted airport.	Relocate to an area that offers existing or possible development of existing infrastructure to comply with the requirement to increase the use of public transport. The area between Braintree and Witham offers the opportunity for connection to the rail network at several stations with an improved service should the Crossing loop be implemented. Potentially the access to both the A12 and A120 will be easier at this location when the result of the proposed routes is made known. None of these suggestions offers any infrastructure improvements for the proposed West of Braintree development.
	29		Miss Cable	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		There seems to be little evidence of a concrete plan to address the issue of increasing local employment opportunities. The area across North Essex is already straining under the amount of commuting individuals are having to undertake, predominantly by car, to obtain reasonably paid work opportunities. There is little point in the authorities citing 'retail' - a sector which in large part employs part-time lower paid roles. To make the plan effective there needs to be a greater focus on 'selling' the area to larger employers.	
	114		Mrs Susan Baugh	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No		There is no large source of employment near to WoB and certainly not a source of employment that will mean that people don't have to drive to work. AECOM and BDC have come up with numbers of job production and working from home that have absolutely no factual based evidence to back them up.	
	141		Mrs S Osborne	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No		OS - West Tey has not employment, infrastructure at capacity, would be dormitory town with little positives as per Kerslake review. NO plans for attracting jobs, reduced bus, and rail is private. NO travel plan. Increase CO2 emissions and local pollution effecting local health. No fast rail till 2058, impact on local tourism due to overdevelopment.	I do not feel West Tey is sustainable and will be self reliant and so she be taken out of the local plan. Nppf 27
	174		Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Employment	

197	Cllr Stephen John Bolter Parish Councillor Gestingthorpe Parish Council	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	THIS REPRESENTATION IS FROM THE HALSTEAD AND HEDINGHAM PERSPECTIVE Halstead and Hedingham have lost many employers, with former industrial sites having been converted to housing. Out commuting has risen greatly, and is unsustainable. Much more effort is required to stimulate local employment. The public transport system is inadequate and the road system is unable to cope with the consequent increase in car traffic. The bus service to Braintree (for employment or onward travel is poor). The roads are poor and cannot cope with the level of outcommuting by car 5.4 Colchester is a major employment centre but: Slow narrow winding road connection. Bus from Halstead does not take the fastest route to Colchester, but serves a number of villages and estates in the Colchester before heading for the town centre. Cambridge and Haverhill are major centres of employment, but there is no public transport to either, and the road north from Hedingham is inadequate.	See comments on Map Braintree 2
547	Mr Phil Bamford Planning Manager Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	O/S See response to Colchester Borough Local Plan Part 1.	
211	Mr Peter Williams Director Williams Group Agent: Mrs Teresa Cook Principal Consultant Emery Planning Partnership Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The policy wording would be clearer if some of the explanatory text was removed outside the policy itself. It is not clear whether the baseline forecast for employment land is to be regarded as a minimum requirement. The title of the policy references retail but the policy wording does not address retail growth requirements.	This strategic policy SP4 should be redrafted for clarity with explanatory text moved outside the policy wording. The policy should clarify whether the baseline employment land forecast is to be regarded as a minimum requirement. The overall requirement for new retail floorspace should be set out within the policy text or a new policy inserted to specifically address strategic level retail and town centre issues.

285	Braintree South Alliance Agent: Mrs Gabrielle Rowan Associate Pegasus Planning Group	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes	Policy SP 4 relates to the provision of employment land across North Essex and its Districts, including Braintree. The Policy sets out Braintrees annual jobs forecast and its employment land requirements for the period 2016 “ 33 for both baseline and higher growth scenarios. It states that œthese two bookends provide flexibility to allow for each authoritys supply trajectory to reflect their differing requirements• . Our client is generally supportive of this strategic-level policy. However, we are concerned about the lack of reference to the need for North Essex Authorities to designate employment land to meet identified need based on robust evidence as to the suitability of those locations. This relates to the earlier points relating to employment provision in Local Plan Policy LPP18	See summary
384	Mrs D Morrall Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	☐	✓	✓	☐	Yes	The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
387	Choice Construction Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	☐	✓	✓	☐	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
388	Barkley Projects Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	☐	✓	✓	☐	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
389	Mr Watson-Steele Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	☐	✓	✓	☐	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.

390	Mr Gavin Day DSG Developments Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
391	Mr D P Nott Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
392	Granville Developments Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
393	Mr Lightly Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
394	Mrs D Golding Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
395	Pertwee Estates Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.

396	Mr G Williamson Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
397	Mrs J Scarlett Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
398	Mrs J Sawyer Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
399	Mr C Coghlan Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
400	Mr R Carter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
401	Mr M Harrington Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.

402	Mr Martin Cowan Poplar Nurseries Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
403	Mr M Spurgeon Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
404	Mr D Clough Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
405	Mr & Mrs Harrison Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
406	The Shepherd Trust Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
407	Mr C Reid Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
408	Mr D White Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
409	Mssrs Parmenter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
410	Mrs D Morrall Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.

411	Mr C Hart Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
412	Mr M Allard Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The Policy SP4 does not incorporate sufficiently precise forecasts of employment land requirements nor relate job creation to population growth. Any mismatch could lead to a potential undersupply of employment and a proportionate increase in out-commuting thereby undermining the sustainability of the Plan as a whole.	Provide more robust figures for employment targets and deliverability relative to housing development.
519	Mr Alistair Andrews Planning Manager Manchester Airport (MAG) - Stansted	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	London Stansted Airport continues to support the vision set out for Braintree in the Publication Draft Local Plan and welcomes the acknowledgment of the airport playing a significant role in the districts economic performance. There are however a number of the previously raised comments and concerns that remain relevant relating to highway impacts and noise. Stansted Airport is concerned that currently the Local Plans future traffic impacts have not been properly accounted for. A principal concern continues to be the effects that both this plan and other emerging local plan developments will have on M11 Junction 8. Reference to the principle of developments contributing to new road infrastructure and considering additional infrastructure requirements of proposals in isolation and as cumulative effects would be welcomed. Specific reference should be made to established flight paths and affected proposed housing sites.	As detailed above.
534	Mr Wheaton Agent: Mr Richard Clews Associate Planner Strutt and Parker LLP	Question not answered	Question not answered	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Please see attached submission letter. We support SP4 and the Plan is considered to be Sound in relation to the allocation of employment land at land West of A131, Great Notley. We would comment on the need for amendments to policies to ensure there is: 1. a positive vision to more easily replace out-dated employment facilities with more suitable facilities in more appropriate locations (LPP2); 2. flexibility in the amount of employment land allocated, including reserved land beyond the Plan (LPP2 and Proposals Map); 3. consideration of the removal of LPP7, which repeats the expectations of the framework; 4. A minor extension of allocation GRNO260 to the south, to better reflect the diversification of the farm.	



560		Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	Add a caveat: and due to changing trends in demand for space, the matter will be subject to periodic review as to need and type of dedicated space actually required to be provided for through land allocations.
581		Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	
641		Dr Natalie Gates Principal Advisor, Historic Places Team Historic England	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered		
	LPPD3 2	Historic Environment Planning Adviser, Historic England	Yes	Yes	No			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			MOVE TO SP5 [Officer summary] The A120 is a historic route through Essex and as such there is great archaeological potential, alongside the potential impacts on heritage assets, which may vary, depending on the options developed.	[Officer interpretation] acknowledge the potential impact on heritage assets.

	LPPD7 2	Mr Steven Brown, Woolf Bond Planning	No	No	No							[Officer summary] From the limited amount of employment land that has been developed [in Tendring] in the recent past, there are viability factors that limit the speculative provision of new employment. The Council's own evidence acknowledges viability as an issue. We therefore object to the proposed de-allocation of land in Weeley for new employment opportunities [as included in the preferred options draft]. However, we are of the view that this should be as part of a mixed use scheme.	[Officer interpretation] Allocate land north of Colchester, Weeley for mixed use development including employment.
	LPPD6 3	Mr David Moseley, Strategic Planner Persimmon Homes	Yes	Yes	Yes							MOVE TO SP3 [Officer summary] Policy SP3 above does not mention that the five-year requirement should be judged against the housing requirement within the Local Plan or that there needs to be an appropriate buffer (i.e. 5% or 20%). The wording of SP3 should reflect para 47 of the NPPF and as such should be amended. It is also not clear what actions the Council will take in the event of a persistent under delivery against housing requirements within the plan. The garden community is very ambitious and there remains significant risk that the timescales for delivery will slip. In the event of persistent under delivery, the Local Plan should set out what actions they shall take. Actions could include a partial review of the plan and allocation of additional housing sites.	[officer interpretation] Amend the wording of Policy SP3 to say: "Each authority will maintain a sufficient supply of deliverable sites sufficient to provide for at least five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer and will work proactively with applicants to bring forward sites that accord with the overall spatial strategy and relevant policies in the plan". Also indicate the actions the authorities will take in the event of under-delivery.
	LPPD9 6	Martin Robeson, Martin Robeson Planning Practice	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓			[Officer summary] The plan should focus on making the relevant districts attractive to inward investment and securing economic success and performance against diverse sectors. If the higher growth scenario is adopted there could be considerable amounts of land identified for employment development that does not then come forward and could constrain sites that are otherwise suitable for development from being able to provide for housing, retail or for other purposes. Nowhere in the policy are retail needs considered, assessed or planned for, despite retail being in the title.	[Officer interpretation] Ensure the allocation of employment land does not constrain sites that are otherwise suitable for alternative forms of development. Address retail needs.

**LPA Response:** The availability of employment land will be kept under review as part of the annual review process and additional land could be allocated if required. Employment figures are set out in the evidence base and will be explored through the examination. The continuous changing nature of employment means the Local Plan should provide a framework upon which employment can take place throughout the plan period. The proposed list of Minor Modifications provides for removal of 'Retail' from the title. The highway implications of growth at London Stansted Airport as well as growth in the local population are noted and the Councils will continue to work with all parties including Highways England and Essex County Council to ensure that all the growth is considered and improvements to public transport accessibility to the airport are made. Whist Braintree Council understands the request for the noting of the current flight path in the Local Plan, it is not considered suitable to be added into the Local Plan. Aside from any minor modifications that may be required, no other changes are considered necessary to SP4.

CBC rep ID	BDC rep ID	TDC rep ID	Name, Organisation		Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/ written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan
				Legally compliant										
<b>Policy SP5</b>														
6066			Robert Brady										Broadband speed in Abberton & Langenhoe presently is unacceptably slow (about 2 mb per second). The 55 houses planned to be built in the village will all be closer to the Peldon Exchange than existing properties and will result in even worse broadband speeds in the rest of the village. We require faster broadband for the whole village, not just the planned new houses.	
6104			Richard Waylen	no	yes	yes	<input type="checkbox"/>				w		Transport Infrastructure and Health provision are key concerns. whilst significant new homes have been provided in recent years little or no improvements to infrastructure have been realised resulting in more congestion and pollution with longer journey times. I believe the council has laboured under the impression that people want to come to Colchester. Not true most want to get across or round the town, not go through it	Guarantees that infrastructure be provided in advance of additional housing particularly to enable through routes. Consideration of using Rail to provide better links to Colchester town from North Station and Clacton area. Provision of improved health care provision, existing Hospital is know to be to small to cope with existing demand
6162			The University of Essex (The JTS Partnership)										The University, particularly, supports the planned improvements for the A12 and A120, which are required both to relieve existing traffic congestion and deliver the housing and employment growth objectives of Colchester, Tendring and Braintree Councils. Most importantly, the University considers that any proposal for major new development on the east side of Colchester must include a new direct road link (preferably of dual carriageway standard) between the A120 and A133. Without major new infrastructure provision, including highway links, any significant development on this side of the town will exacerbate existing traffic congestion.	None
6209			North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group									yes	The CCG would also like to draw attention to the requirement of improved technology, to accessibility of services through broadband across the borough and as such may request mitigation for improved broadband connections associated with any major developments	None
6259			Diocese of Chelmsford (Church of England)	yes	yes	no	✓	✓	✓		h		The section of Policy SP5 on health is not compliant with the NPPF section 171 because it does not mention well-being. Consequently the proposals for new facilities are too limited and, specifically, there is no mention of places of worship as in NPPF section 171.	For Policy SP5 to be sound the whole of Section 171 of the NPPF should be added as an extra bullet point, including mention of places of worship.

6271		Marks Tey Church											Policy SP5 is excellent, but on past performance, Marks Tey local people do not trust CBC to deliver the policy benefits. Key areas are Transport and Health (community facilities)	None
6278		Wivenhoe Town Council (Hazel Humphreys)	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓		A			The Infrastructure and Connectivity plan describes the positive objectives that are sought but is not sound in the methodology set out to achieve those aims. While the planned infrastructure and connectivity of the garden communities are highlighted the plan does not identify how these new communities will attract the scale of investment required to upgrade the regional inter-urban and intra-urban links such communities would require. Our particularly awkward geographical location is portrayed as a strength while the plan does not address the very real intra-urban connectivity problems. These points also apply to our submissions made UNDER SP7 and SP8	Major infrastructure improvements must occur before this plan is approved. The volume of dwellings exceeds the provision of infrastructure and it is imperative that it significantly reduces. The A133 is included in the plan only in generic detail despite its significant impact on our communities and the new town must be designed in such a way that traffic enters the fabled A120 link\Bromley Rd route into Colchester and cause no additional burden to the A133 which currently operates in excess of capacity. Cycling is NOT the answer for 25,000 people and must carry significantly less weighting in transport provision.
6363		Sean Pordham	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓		w			Again, the paper talks about improving transport but there are no timescales or commitments given. As the consultation states the A12 and A120 trunk roads cannot support the GC to be located at Marks Tey so what assurances will be given by the council that the new GC will not be developed prior to the infrastructure being put in place i.e. roads, rail, schools and hospitals.	Again, the paper talks about improving transport but there are no timescales or commitments given. As the consultation states the A12 and A120 trunk roads cannot support the GC to be located at Marks Tey so what assurances will be given by the council that the new GC will not be developed prior to the infrastructure being put in place i.e. roads, rail, schools and hospitals.
6437		RSPB	yes	yes	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	A			Point 20 only seeks the "Protection and/or enhancement of heritage and biodiversity assets". This is not consistent with the NPPF (para 156) or Policy SP7.	Remove "/or" from point 20.
6420		CAUSE (Rosie Pearson)	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	A	yes	West Tey is not a sustainable location and the infrastructure promises are not realistic, viable or deliverable. Our evidence is available here: <a href="http://www.cause4livingessex.com/about-cause/cause-papers-and-evidence/">http://www.cause4livingessex.com/about-cause/cause-papers-and-evidence/</a>	Our response sets out reasons why the Plan is not positively prepared, justified, effective or compliant with national policy. See appendix 1, page 12, for detailed amendments required: <a href="http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf">http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf</a>	
6458		Fenn Wright	yes	no	no	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		w			The 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.	Amend the wording of the first line of the Policy as follows: "Development must be supported by the identification and delivery of strategic infrastructure, services and facilities required to serve the needs of the community in parallel with the completion of development"

6489		Andrew Martin Planning	yes	yes	no	✓	✓	✓		A	yes	Objection is raised to the restriction of growth in the Colchester/Braintree Garden Community, pending improved road infrastructure in respect of the A12 and A120. An early phase of growth at East Marks Tey could be served by the existing road network. A proposed allocation at this location would bring about a number of short term benefits in terms of infrastructure and connectivity. It could act as a pumpprimer for the provision of largescale infrastructure, enhance connections to existing and neighbouring communities and promote a wider range of services and facilities to the benefit of the area.	Plan to be amended to include an allocation for residential development at East Marks Tey, to both act as a free-standing development in the absence of the new Garden Community and act as an initial phase and gateway into a larger comprehensive scheme.
6548		Campaign to Protect Rural Essex	yes	yes	no	✓	✓	✓		h		In view of the &quot;infrastructure first&quot; requirement and uncertainties regarding critical transport infrastructure improvements, the creation of a new garden community at West Tey is premature, unviable and unjustified.	In deciding where to allocate new housing, access to public transport as well as the location of services in the settlement hierarchy must be taken into account. To help promote connectivity, the provision of a meaningful network of cycleways and footpaths is essential and bus routes will need to be diverted to serve the new communities. The preparation of Green Travel Plans will therefore be an important element of the Development Plan Documents.
6586		Martin Goss										Electric charging points are key and must be included with every house, flat by default for all new developments. Retail outlets should also include them by default for their customers along with commercial premises. Electric charging points are key to the future of transport changes where petrol and diesel cars will be outlawed by 2040.	Electric charging points are key and must be included with every house, flat by default for all new developments. Retail outlets should also include them by default for their customers along with commercial premises. Electric charging points are key to the future of transport changes where petrol and diesel cars will be outlawed by 2040.
6614		Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting (Fenn Wright)	yes	no	no		✓			h		The wording of the Policy is unclear as to its practical intentions and should be amended to require the delivery of necessary strategic infrastructure in advance of or in parallel with the specified need.	Amend the wording of the first line of the Policy as follows: "Development must be supported by the identification and delivery of strategic infrastructure, services and facilities required to serve the needs of the community in advance of the completion of each development"
6744		Mike Lambert	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓		h	yes	The Plan fails to meet the test of soundness in terms of being 'Effective' - ie. 'the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross boundary strategic priorities', in relation to the NGCs in general and CBBGC in particular, because the Plan fails to demonstrate that the NGCs are deliverable, in terms of the necessary supporting infrastructure, or within the Plan period to 2033, during which time the Council is relying on the NGCs to deliver 7500 new homes	Delete policy and replace with an infrastructure delivery plan that clearly relates the commencement and rate of delivery to the provision of key infrastructure. The policy as drafted does not achieve the Councils' stated objective of 'Infrastructure first' but provides a wish list of improvements over which it has little control. This policy also needs to be explicit about what level of infrastructure is required as a pre-requisite for the initial phase of 2500 at each of the Strategic Growth Locations.
6796		Marks Tey Parish Council (PJPC Ltd)	yes	no	yes				✓	h		As currently worded, the first sentence of this policy is not linked to the strategic priorities set out. It needs to be re-worded to make it clear that all development is expected to contribute to or to demonstrate how the states strategic priorities will be achieved as appropriate / relevant.	re word as suggested

6843		William Sunnucks	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	h		The garden communities need massive investment in road, rail and MRT systems if they are to be sustainable. But the Hyas viability study, the only evidence we have that these items are fundable, contains a material error and shows exactly the opposite.	Please change 6.2 to describe the existing rail system correctly. It links the major towns and cities to London, but not (in the case of Colchester and Braintree) to each other. And capacity of the GEML is constrained (as confirmed by AECOM, Network Rail and CAUSE research), so it is wrong to describe it as high capacity. To be sound the plan needs more detail about transport infrastructure to be delivered in the plan period to 2033. * The Garden Communities are planned over 50 years with much of the key infrastructure only appearing in 2058 (per Hyas); * The NPPF requires the plan to be sound over the plan period which ends in 2033 * Residents have been promised the key infrastructure "first or alongside" and will want to see it delivered in their lifetimes; * It is not clear how £9m will be spent on Marks Tey Station in 2026 followed by £50m on a new West Tey station in 2058. Will there be two stations so close together on a main line? Or will the £9m be wasted?; * It is not made clear that West Tey cannot be started until the A120 is dualled (or incidentally that West Braintree cannot be started until the mineral issues are resolved and a credible partnership formed with Uttlesford).
6821		Marion Attewell	no	no	no	✓				w		Problem of joining or exiting from the A120 from adjacent villages that would result from such a massive influx of new users. Existing congestion on the A12 would be intensified - let alone total nightmare junction of A120 and A12 which does not allow traffic to get upto speed. Total inadequacy of car parking availability at Marks Tey station to serve proposed development.	Several roundabouts and widening of A120 between Coggeshall and Marks Tey would be needed unless the road is moved to join A12 beyond the proposed development. The latter change would also allow for a better junction between the two roads. Marks Tey station would need a multi story car park to cope which would be an eyesore in the area.
6889		Natural England			no				x			We advise that transport infrastructure provides an opportunity to achieve net gain in nature as detailed in paragraph 9 of the NPPF through biodiversity enhancement and through the creation and linkage of habitat corridors. See our advice on the dualling of the A120 and Marks Tey Brickpit SSSI in Policy SP9.	No specific wording provided.

6908		Persimmon Homes			no							Whilst it is agreed that development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities, a significant amount of items identified rely upon third parties or wider investment decisions. Policy SP5 should be amended to recognise role Council has in terms of influencing, co-ordinating and delivering infrastructure and connectivity. Policy SP5 should also be amended to recognise the role that obligations through s106 or Cil should make in addressing infrastructure needs arising from new development. It is important that the totality of costs to be borne by the proposed level of development is adequately assessed.	Policy SP5 should be amended to recognise role Council has in terms of influencing, co-ordinating and delivering infrastructure and connectivity. Policy SP5 should also be amended to recognise the role that obligations through s106 or Cil should make in addressing infrastructure needs arising from new development.
6938		Historic England										A120 is historic route through Essex and has great archaeological potential, alongside potential impacts on heritage assets, which may vary depending on options developed. Explanatory text should reference guide on broadband.	No specific wording provided,. Reference should be made on broadband provision to guidance document.
7011		Peter Kay, C-Bus								Yes		The massive 'Garden Developments' are promoted as tolerable only on the basis of stepchanging 'rapid transit' and an unprecedentedly low %of journeys being made by car. Accordingly they cannot logically be approved until such time as both these things are proved viable, yet CBC seem to be seeking approval for them now in the basis of details of the 'rapid-transit' being unmentioned until two years time. On transport issues the plan is largely a wish list of projects that CBC would like other parties to undertake to ensure that its massive housing developments do not produce disaster.	
7018		Jennifer Yates										*Officers interpretation: -the plan and surrounding literature is not in laymens terms -There is insufficient infrastructure for the planned growth -there are not enough infrastructure improvements planned -the projections indicated are unclear and inaccessible	Rather than confuse the public with legal jargon and difficult to complete forms, it would be far better to show facts and give figures on projected demands rather than saying these will be looked at and your plans to meet future demands.
7038		Cushman and Wakefield								yes		We welcome the Council's position in seeking to align development with accessible locations, alongside promoting greater use of alternatives to the private car. However this section does not mention Colchester Town Centre as being a highly accessible location, nor as a preferred location for development given its high accessibility index and this should be addressed.	

7091		Department of Education. Skills and Funding									The ESFA supports the principles set out in policy SP5 for new development to be supported by the infrastructure required to meet the needs arising from that development and the strategic priorities identified. The policy refers to "larger developments setting aside land and/or contributing to the cost of delivering land for new schools where required". We suggest it would also be useful to provide further wording regarding contributions to make it clear that for larger sites developers should be both providing the land for new schools (to meet demand from the development) and funding /contributing to the cost of construction	amend policy to make it clear that for larger sites developers should be both providing the land for new schools (to meet demand arising from the new development) and funding or contributing to the cost of their construction. As such the Policy would read "...with larger developments setting aside land and/or contributing to the cost of delivering land for new schools where required, as well as funding or contributing to the cost of building the new schools". 'Larger developments' should also be clearly defined. These amendments would ensure that the delivery requirements are clear and that the plan is 'effective'.
7107		Mark Tonge									If A12 widening and new A120 will both involve compulsory purchase, why not purchase wider strips of land to be able to add a new train line from Marks Tey to Stansted and new additional track from Marks Tey to Shenfield to link to new Cross Rail – such ideas are visionary and strategic and would form part of an economic generator for the region. What has been Abellio Greater Anglia's contribution to the draft plan? What has been network rail's contribution to the draft plan? What has been the Department of Transport's contribution to the draft plan? How does this local plan fit and integrate with regional and UK master plans?	None
7124		Hopkins Homes (Pegasus Group, Nicky Parsons)	yes	yes	no	<input type="checkbox"/>		✓	h	yes	The previous objection to the use of the word 'must' in the first paragraph of this policy is maintained. As commented previously, it is important that the wording of this policy takes into account that a developer is rarely the provider of infrastructure. A good example is healthcare provision. A developer can reasonably be required to contribute towards healthcare (in the absence of CIL) but cannot be responsible for delivering the healthcare facility. The delivery of the facility relies on the actions of NHS England not the developer. As currently worded the policy is not consistent with national policy.	Include the following phrase in policy SP5: "New development must include measures to mitigate the impact of the proposal on infrastructure, services and facilities. In all cases, the measures must be sufficient to address the needs arising from the new development."



7148		Sport England (Taylor)			no		✓	✓	✓			The strategic infrastructure in policy SP5 do not include leisure/sport) and recreation facilities. Such facilities are key to delivering wider health and well-being priorities in North Essex. The lack of consideration, is concerning as opportunities for co-ordinating strategic leisure/recreation provision with other infrastructure types and cross border facility provision may be missed and the benefits of co-location, and encouraging active lifestyles not realised. These are particularly relevant to the proposed cross-boundary garden communities and would help meet the 'effective' soundness test. The 3 indoor/outdoor strategies should be used for inform strategic infrastructure needs across North Essex.	To address this concern, it is requested that leisure and recreation is added to the infrastructure types that are covered by policy SP5 and that the policy sets out the principles of meeting needs for this infrastructure type e.g. addressing the leisure and recreation facility needs identified in the respective evidence bases including any specific facility needs that are of strategic importance across the three local authority areas, using the garden communities and other developments to maximise the opportunities for encouraging healthy and active lifestyles through the use of 'Active Design' principles, safeguarding and enhancing existing facilities that help meet existing and future needs etc. The supporting text should refer to the authorities evidence bases for sport and recreation and provide more detail about how leisure and recreation objectives will be met on a strategic basis. This suggested amendment would improve the soundness of the plan in relation to meeting the 'justified', 'effective' and consistent with national policy' tests
7155		Pegasus (Nicky Parsons) for Bloor Homes Eastern	yes	yes	no				✓	h		The requirement that a development must be supported by infrastructure, services and facilities identified to serve the needs arising from the development is retained and as such so too is my client's objection to this. This obligation is unreasonable and an unjustified burden on a developer. A developer can only provide the mechanisms to allow the infrastructure provider to provide the services - it cannot provide the services. For example, funding for new school places can be provided but the provision of those spaces will be down to the LEA. The policy is not consistent with national policy.	The change requested previously is repeated, which is to include the following phrase in policy SP5: "New development must include measures to mitigate the impact of the proposal on infrastructure, services and facilities. In all cases, the measures must be sufficient to address the needs arising from the new development."
7197		Colchester Hospital Trust			no							Growth in housing has implications for local hospital services. Concerns over population figures in Infrastructure Delivery Plan - growth underestimated.	
7212		Stormont Cox			no					h		Transport Links to and from Colchester - concern raised about rail and road (A12 & A120) capacity to support garden community. More expenditure needed.	

7465		Leonie Alpin, Maldon District Council			no			✓					the A12 junction improvements at Marks Tey must be designed and built to accommodate the total proposed 24,000 homes in the Garden Community not just that planned for this plan period. S106/CIL contributions from these developments should include contributions towards cycle and footpath routes to enable non-car access to leisure and recreation destinations in adjoining districts. School pupils are shared across district boundaries. S106 agreements must take into account the impact on schools in Maldon District.	
7480		Lightwood Strategic											Monks Wood should be identified as part of the shared spatial strategy for North Essex. Full representation form and documents attached to support this	
	2	Mrs Claire Reece	Yes	Yes	No	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Yes		The traffic at present is terrible. The A131 from Halsted to the roundabout for the A120 cannot cope at the moment and to add 1000 homes at Straits Mill would mean at least another 1,500-2000 cars on the road. This will not work. Braintree will grind to a terrible halt.	
	13	Mr Stephen Archer	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Yes		You cannot have a plan for housing without a plan for roads & other transport to serve current & future needs. This does not do this	
	17	Mr Philip Unwin	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>		No		Vague mention of study/report contents with no tangible or enforceable content shown.	Quantify this report content mentioned, we need to know what is needed in order for us to make informed decisions.
	21	Mr S Thorp	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>		No		West Tey and/or Monks Wood development is not sustainable or economically viable - in terms of housing, environment, roads, public transport or employment.	The location chosen for development at West Tey should be completely reviewed for the reasons outlined in the full representation given.
	30	Miss Cable	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>		No		Too much reliance on external agencies to deliver key infrastructure to support the development of additional housing - will the money ever be available and allocated within national priorities. Local roads particularly A131 are a problem already - with daily congestion along single carriageways. Housing developments already approved are consistently adding to the strain on this route. Public transport promotion - bus routes year on year are being reduced in the BDC district; It seems a ridiculous statement to suggest public transport will be promoted when commuter timed journeys are just not being provided.	
	34	Ms Sue Dobson Bridleways Development Officer Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓		Yes		O/S - No mention of equestrian use of highways and rights of way network. Equestrian access should be included under relevant policies. All new ways should be accessible to all users.	Amend the wording to those paragraphs detailed above to include the points made with respect to equestrian access.
	62	Mr Barry Shaw	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		No		O/S - Garden towns will ruin north Essex. Infrastructure, scheme does not sit well in the area. cycling to work not practical. North Essex will become a concrete jungle.	

79	Mr Christopher Bailey Owner Agent: Mr Christopher Bailey Clockhouse Town Planning	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	Paragraphs 6.2-6.4 make demonstrably inaccurate statements. From that point forward the plan is being developed from a false evidence base which it is not positively prepared, justified by evidence and hence is not able to be effective	Redraft to reflect reality of the over congested transport infrastructure and poorly situated situation of the District.
95	Mrs Julie Marshall	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	O/S Public transport is poor, no where for people to work, extra car journeys, no schools or funding, no gp's and Essex hospitals being downgraded, development no keen on building community facilities.	
100	Mr Graham Dalby	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	The plan is unlikely to allow more people to move away from cars to other, less environmentally damaging forms of transport.	Improved roads with cycle lanes need to be provided to improve the existing situation, whether or not new houses are built.
106	Mr Garry Adams	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	The implementation the West of Braintree Garden Community will add 500 vehicles per hour at peak times to the A120. This will overload an already overloaded route. BDC has no means to guarantee that the highway junctions, highway capacity, water provision, and other basic infrastructure will be provided. The plan states that these items are outside BDC's control and relies on optimistic assumptions regarding the timely provision of funds and political will from other bodies. There should be a presumption against development in the absence bankable guarantees regarding strategic infrastructure and a statement that development can only proceed AFTER the infrastructure is fully in place.	
119	Mr Kevin Fraser Principal Planner, Spatial Planning Team Essex County Council Spatial Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	A change required for clarification. Sustainable transport will play an important role in and around urban areas and the Garden Communities. Change paragraph 6.3 as follows: .. significantly improve connectivity across and within the area. A focus on sustainable transport in and around urban areas and the Garden Communities will positively alter travel patterns and behaviour to reduce reliance on the private car.	OS The ECC response to each Draft Publication Plan recommends several areas where clarification is sought to enable effective delivery and minor amendments to improve policy and explanatory text.
120	Mr Kevin Fraser Principal Planner, Spatial Planning Team Essex County Council Spatial Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	The change strengthens linkages to the Essex Local Transport Plan (LTP), adopted in 2011. Change paragraph 6.4 as follows: The Local Plans seek to improve transport infrastructure to enable the efficient movement of people, goods and ensure that new development is accessible by sustainable forms of transport. Measures !..	

121	Mr Kevin Fraser Principal Planner, Spatial Planning Team Essex County Council Spatial Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	The change replaces strategic with main to differentiate from the Highways England network. This terminology is also consistent with the Ressa Jeffries study proposals for an English network of main roads. Change paragraph 6.11 as follows: 'Route-based strategies are prepared and delivered by the County Council for main strategic road corridors!.	
122	Mr Kevin Fraser Principal Planner, Spatial Planning Team Essex County Council Spatial Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	The change clarifies the franchise changes that will improve service/capacity. Change paragraph 6.15 as follows: In 2016 a new nine year franchise was awarded to Greater Anglia to operate passenger services in the region. The franchise includes a commitment to replace the entire train fleet during 2019 and 2020, which in combination with a new timetable will significantly increase passenger capacity	
133	Mrs Julie Marshall	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	The local roads will not stand thousands more car journeys to and from Braintree, Stansted and further afield. I live off the Shalford Green to Saling Road and now sometimes I cannot get out of my driveway for the amount of cars using the single track lane as a cut through, let alone the large agricultural vehicles that use the local roads.	
138	Mr Ben Chandler	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposed road infrastructure for the West of Braintree development is not sufficient to meet Emergency Service Access rules on numbers of people. Accordingly the plan is not legally compliant. There has been no meetings or agreements with Uttlesford DC to outline and demonstrate agreed infrastructure. Accordingly the Local Plan does not comply with the Duty-to-Cooperate. The NPPF Garden Communities principles clearly state that rail & bus services should be a key consideration in a garden settlement. The West of Braintree proposal has no rail connectivity, and there is no information about bus services in the plan. The settlement will become a 10,000 home commuter town with car travel the only way to get to employment opportunities away from the area. For this reason the plan is not sound.	The plan should remove the West of Braintree settlement as a proposed option, as it cannot become legally compliant or sound with this in.

150		Mrs S Osborne	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓		Yes	4633868	Unrealistic financial contingency planning of 5% ,, uplift closer to,40% would be more realistic. A12 & A120 improvements have not been realised as yet & A120 hasn't been accepted in to the RIS2 funding round. Extreme concerns that plan is based on infrastructure aspirations rather than reality & have over simplistically based housing development locations on land & villages next to A12 and A120 as 'strategic growth areas. ' The plan doesn't take in to account the context of these villages being old with historically poor infrastructure & key roads in both coggeshall & kelvedon being essentially a single car passing while the cars in the other direction having to wait. This impacts on the ability of these 'services villages' to respond & adapt to increase traffic load from the amount of development being forced upon them & the surrounding area.Approaches to Kelvedon station being directly effected by this issue. Local health care provision overstretched Ruralbroadband Reliable?	Unrealistic financial contingency planning...this needs to be addressed. No further development until infrastructure is sustainable. Detailed financial information needs to be provided as to how they expect to pay for the A120 and what deal will be made with private transport providers and also how issues and capacity in rail and also bus provision is to be improved. Transport solutions need to be realised before the development start to be built.
158		Henry Price	Yes	No	No	✓	✓	☐	✓		Yes		The LP is ineffective as it fails to demonstrate how transport can be made 'sustainable' in garden communities. Furthermore, the GC strategy fundamentally relies on road and rail improvements which are outside the councils' control and which it acknowledges may in any case be unfundable. The GC strategy is thus fatally flawed, making the LP unjustified and ineffective, thus unsound.	I argue above that the GC elements of the LP are fundamentally and fatally flawed and should be deleted, to be replaced by proper examination of brownfield and other sites.
176		Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	☐	☐	☐	☐		No		Infrastructure	
194		Cllr Stephen John Bolter Parish Councillor Gestingthorpe ParishCouncil	Yes	Yes	No	☐	☐	✓	☐		No		6.12 This plan should be informing Essex County Council of the highway needs of residents, not just announcing that plans for the A131 will arrive post 18/19. Development potential in halstead depends on these plans. There is nothing about transport links to the major employment centres in Haverhill and Cambridge, or about links from Halstead toCambridge.	Relating development to transport. This should be a real plan, not a vague wish list.
223		Mrs Geraldine Simmons Clerk Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting	Yes	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓		Yes		Policy SP5 - The Authorities inability to deliver urgently needed and essential Infrastructure	Amend Policy SP5 to make it clear that all housing growth will be phased to match delivery of specific infrastructure projects and transport improvements such as the M11-A120 Link, new mass transport solutions and the A12 widening project

561	Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	6.5 Add to the last sentence!.to ensure it is sustainable 6.24 Third line delete the word promote and replace it with ensure. Last line add the words rapid and integrated 6.25 Add in the first sentence ;and new garden communities. 6.30 4th sentence delete words are encouraged to and replace with will be required
562	Mr S Brice R A Brice & Partners Agent: Mr Olivier Spencer Associate Andrew Martin Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Subject to the Planning Inspectorate and Highways England preferring a new A12 bypass to the south of Junction 22 and Rivenhall End, Mr Brice intends to promote a future new employment area, for a gateway-style business park, near Coleman's Farm. This promotion is likely to be pursued in earnest through the next local plan cycle, once the emerging Braintree Local Plan has been completed.	N/A
563	Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	Second bullet delete by promoting and replace it with to ensure Forth bullet delete the first word Support Fifth bullet replace first word with the word Prioritisation of Sub bullet one of the fifth bullet, add after the word with the words rapid transport Last bullet replace first word with the words Development of
565	Mr S Brice R A Brice & Partners Agent: Mr Olivier Spencer Associate Andrew Martin Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	If ECC decides to identify Route Option B, C, D or E as its "preferred option" for the dualling of the A120, between Braintree and the A12, Mr Brice would seek a new grade separated junction on or adjacent to his land, to provide the potential for a future new Garden Village at Parkgate Farm.	N/A

619		Mr Kevin Fraser Principal Planner, Spatial Planning Team Essex County Council Spatial Planning	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			6.30 Fast broadband connections and telecommunications are an increasingly important requirement to serve all development. New development should contribute to the creation of a comprehensive and effective network in both urban and rural areas to promote economic competitiveness and to reduce the need to travel. The priority is to secure the earliest availability for universal broadband coverage and fastest connection speeds for all existing and new developments. Developers are encouraged to engage with broadband providers. Where provision is possible broadband must be installed on an open access basis and which will need to be directly accessed from the nearest British Telecom exchange and threaded through resistant tubing to enable easy access to the fibre optic cable for future repair, replacement or upgrading.	6.30 Remove: 'which will need to be directly accessed from the nearest British Telecom exchange and...'
	625	Mr Douglas McNab Forward Planning Manager - South East Education and Skills Funding Agency Department For Education	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Question not answered		
	28	Mr Alan Pryor	Question not answered	Question not answered	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		The ESFA welcomes reference within the plan (section 6B) to adopting a coordinated approach to infrastructure planning across North Essex, including by ensuring new development provides for new and expanded schools in accordance with the details in districts Infrastructure Delivery Plans.	
	32	mr wesley dearsley	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Road and rail infrastructure is already at capacity or exceeding eg A12/A120, Greater Anglia line and building thousands of homes with no regard to improvements occurring first is not logical. Healthcare and schooling is also not accounted for. Primary schools in Kelvedon are already oversubscribed, secondary schools are limited - adding hundreds/thousands of homes will worsen this. Public transport is virtually non-existent	Small environmentally sustainable communities " 5,000 people max.

	35	Ms Sue Dobson Bridleways Development Officer Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	Yes		Policy SP5 Infrastructure and Connectivity: under Transport, bullet point 9 this states that there will be a comprehensive network of segregated walking and cycling routes! For this Plan to be considered sound, we suggest that routes should be accessible for ALL users, including equestrians, to ensure that off-road access is available. This will ensure that the Plan can be fully inclusive and not discriminate against one user sector.	Amend the Policy wording to incorporate reference to equestrian access and the points made in the representation.
	49	Mr Stephen Walsh vice chairman Unex Group Holdings Limited Agent: Mr Greg Pearce Senior Planner David Lock Associates	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	4633504	O/S: Supports the proposed strategic priorities for infrastructure provision for the district and acknowledges that the provision of appropriate and timely infrastructure, which supports growth at the former Towerlands Park.	
	52	Sport England Sport England Planning Manager Eastern Region Sport England	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	No		O/s: The list of strategic infrastructure should give appropriate consideration to leisure and recreation facilities, and the potential for co-ordinating with other infrastructure like schools or health hubs. Opportunities for cross-boundary facility provision may be missed. It is requested that leisure and recreation is added to the infrastructure types that are covered by policy SP5 and that the policy sets out the principles of meeting needs for this infrastructure type.	To address this concern, it is requested that leisure and recreation is added to the infrastructure types that are covered by policy SP5 and that the policy sets out the principles of meeting needs for this infrastructure type e.g. addressing the leisure and recreation facility needs identified in the respective evidence bases including any specific facility needs that are of strategic importance across the three local authority areas, using the garden communities and other developments to maximise the opportunities for encouraging healthy and active lifestyles through the use of Active Design principles, safeguarding and enhancing existing facilities that help meet existing and future needs etc. The supporting text should refer to the authorities evidence bases for sport and recreation and provide more detail about how leisure and recreation objectives will be met on a strategic basis. This suggested amendment would improve the soundness of the plan in relation to meeting the justified, effective and consistent with national policy tests
	80	Mr Christopher Bailey Owner Agent: Mr Christopher Bailey Clockhouse Town Planning	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		This policy makes a number of false statements about the existing infrastructure and location of the district. As such it is not positively planned being based on false assumptions. This renders the plan unjustified and thus ineffective	Redraft to offer an accurate portrait of the district tat acknowledges the existing overloaded condition of the transport network and the disadvantaged location of the district between the sea and to the East of London.



87		Mrs Karen Melville-Ross Clerk Ashen PC	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		The Parish Council strongly supports the policy to ensure that new development is supported by the required infrastructure so that it is available to meet the requirements from the outset of development.
107		Mrs Susan Baugh	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No		NON-COMPLIANT WITH NPPF TRANSPORTATION, POLLUTION POLICY OR POLICY ON COSTINGS OF PROJECTS, INCREASE IN TRAFFIC CONGESTION, LACK OF WATER IN THE AREA, NEED FOR WATER TREATMENT PLANT, PRIMARY SUBSTATION, SCHOOLS, HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS.
123		Mr Kevin Fraser Principal Planner, Spatial Planning Team Essex County Council Spatial Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Wording strengthened to include enable as well as promote which will be essential for achieving sustainable travel patterns. Change second bullet point under Transport heading as follows: Substantially improved connectivity by promoting to promote and enable more sustainable travel patterns, introducing urban transport packages to increase transport choice, providing better public transport infrastructure and services, and enhanced inter urban transport corridors
193		David Andrews	No	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Although the plan seems to say the right things, local authorities have little control over infrastructure. Traffic in the county is already at unsustainable levels in the current state of the roads, partly because people no longer live where they work, and a changing demographic profile. The large developments in Bocking would lead to complete gridlock unless there were major changes to the road system. Buses and cycle tracks will not solve the problem. For the Broad Rd development, is there access from the A131 included in LPP 48? The A131 here would surely have to be dualled. It already blocks at the roundabout with the A120. Greater Anglia may be buying new rolling stock, but will Network Rail improve the track? What are 'high quality rapid transit networks' between the Garden Communities and the urban centres??

212	Mr Peter Williams Director Williams Group Agent: Mrs Teresa Cook Principal Consultant Emery Planning Partnership Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	4634358	The plans for upgrading the A120 will have a significant impact on the potential for growth around South East Braintree. The local route alignment, in particular, will be a very significant factor in planning this part of the town. At present, there is no recognition of this and virtually no allocations. It is unfortunate that the Local Plan is proceeding ahead of the recommendation on the preferred route being made to the Secretary of State for Transport.	The Local Plan should explicitly acknowledge the need for changes to the Plan once the outcome of the consultation on the A120 route options is known. The approach to incorporating these changes will depend on the timing of the Plan examination process and the issuing of the A120 route decision. It is possible that changes could be advanced by way of Main Modifications to the Plan if the examination is still open when the preferred route is announced. Alternatively, the Plan should identify that there will be an early review to respond to the A120 route proposals. The potential for rapid transit services in Braintree should be expanded beyond connections with the garden communities.
228	Mr Stuart McAdam	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Persimmon Homes strongly suggest Braintree is at risk of not being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply during in the course of the plan period and the delivery of sufficient housing within the overall Plan period. The Draft Local Plan does not: -adequately consider increased migration from London - impact of London not meeting its own housing need - Effectively assess key market signals In order to future proof the plan, it is suggested that the Council should seek to allocate reserved sites which can be brought forward if Braintree see an increase in their housing needs	Policy SP5 should be amended to recognise the role the Councils has in terms of influencing, co-ordinating and delivering infrastructure and connectivity. Policy SP5 should also be amended to recognise the role that obligations through s106 or CIL should make in addressing infrastructure needs arising from the new development.
344	Mr David Burch Director of Policy Essex Chamber of Commerce	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		O/S Essex Chambers of Commerce are happy to support in principle much of the draft local plans and in particular for section one relating to the North Essex Strategic Section One.  The developments are long term and it is important for the developments to include provision for employment, healthcare and education and sites should be developed early and not after many of the proposed dwellings have been occupied.  Construction of infrastructure needs to be undertaken at the earliest opportunity in these developments especially with regard to road access. The existing areas of these schemes suffer from congestion, especially at peak times, and are unlikely to cope with increased traffic. Given the increasing growth in homeworking high speed broadband should be installed throughout the communities at the start of their construction.	

524		Consultation Service Natural England	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		UNSOUND (Not consistent with the NPPF). We still advise that transport infrastructure provides opportunity to achieve net gain in nature as detailed in paragraph 9 of the NPPF through biodiversity enhancement and through the creation and linkage of habitat corridors. See our advice on the dualling of the A120 and Marks Tey Brickpit SSSI in Policy SP9.	
572		The Crown Estate Office Agent: Ms Helena Deaville Amec Foster Wheeler	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		O/S - Policy SP5 on Infrastructure and Connectivity is welcomed. We would suggest a modification to the policy to prioritise growth in locations that can make best use of committed infrastructure improvements and where they can deliver wider infrastructure benefits.	
584		Mr Mark Norman Highways England	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered		<p>O/S - We welcome the opportunity to comment upon your local plan. We note that the three authorities have coordinated their local plans and that the first part of the plan applies to all three authorities. This approach gives a better overview of the effect of development over the joint area.</p> <p>The strategic network has capacity issues which would hinder growth aspirations and need significant improvement which has been recognized in emerging roads strategies, and have consulted on improvement options.</p> <p>It has been recognised that the A120 between Braintree and the A12 is nearing capacity, most noticeably at peak times and the feasibility of upgrading this route to a dual carriageway is being explored by ECC. With a view to submitting this for inclusion into a future RIS-2</p> <p>Careful planning is needed to ensure development is in the best place and available when needed.</p> <p>We support the policies in the plan aimed at reducing the need to travel by private car and allow home working.</p>	
597		Mrs Carol Richards Diocese of Chelmsford	Question not answered	Question not answered	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered		Please refer to response letter on behalf of The Crown Estate for all comments on the Local Plan.	For Policy SP5 to be sound the whole of Section 171 of the NPPF should be added as an extra bullet point, including mention of places of worship.

605		Cllr Andrew Hensman Cllr Braintree Central & Beckers Green Ward	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		To serve these better is to add provision for public transport. Returning the railway from Braintree Westwards, it could be connected to Stansted airport via Rayne, the new settlement near Sailing, North of Dunmow into the airport with a parkway station built to serve those commuters from the wider district currently using cars to get to Chelmsford or Witham. This would increase the service to half-hourly, and give resilience for when the mainline is closed between Stratford and Witham. It will also make the District a more attractive place to live and work. My main reasons is with the government's desire to ban combustion engine vehicles by 2040 this district needs to use this plan to prepare for this with it happening within 7 years of its end.	
626		Mr Douglas McNab Forward Planning Manager - South East Education and Skills Funding Agency Department For Education	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		The ESFA supports the requirement established in policy SP5 for new development to be supported by the infrastructure required to meet the needs arising from that development. We also support the strategic education infrastructure priorities identified, particularly the focus on providing sufficient school places. The policy refers to 'larger developments setting aside land and/or contributing to the cost of delivering land for new schools where required'.	We suggest it would also be useful to refer to developer contributions to the build cost of new schools here, to make it clear that for larger sites developers should be both providing the land for new schools (to meet demand arising from the new development) and funding or contributing to the cost of their construction. As such the Policy would read 'with larger developments setting aside land and/or contributing to the cost of delivering land for new schools where required, as well as funding or contributing to the cost of building the new schools'. Larger developments should also be clearly defined. These amendments would ensure that the delivery requirements are clear and that the plan is effective.
	LPPD17	Mr Douglas McNab, Forward Planning Manager - South East Education & Skills Funding Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			The ESFA supports the principles set out in policy SP5 for new development to be supported by the infrastructure required to meet the needs arising from that development and the strategic priorities identified. The policy refers to "larger developments setting aside land and/or contributing to the cost of delivering land for new schools where required". We suggest it would also be useful to provide further wording regarding contributions to make it clear that for larger sites developers should be both providing the land for new schools (to meet demand from the development) and funding /contributing to the cost of construction	amend policy to make it clear that for larger sites developers should be both providing the land for new schools (to meet demand arising from the new development) and funding or contributing to the cost of their construction. As such the Policy would read "...with larger developments setting aside land and/or contributing to the cost of delivering land for new schools where required, as well as funding or contributing to the cost of building the new schools". 'Larger developments' should also be clearly defined. These amendments would ensure that the delivery requirements are clear and that the plan is 'effective'.

		LPPD22	Mr Andrew Hunter, Planning Advisor - Sustainable Places Team Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			[Officer summary] There is no similar overarching policy that addresses other 'environmental' infrastructure such as further waste water or flood risk infrastructure to help accommodate the proposed growth. This is particularly important given that the sustainability, in particular, of low lying coastal communities, will be ever more dependent on replacement and/or enlarged flood defence infrastructure to address sea level rises as a consequence of climate change over a development's lifetime. Tendring District Council or developers will need to help with Partnership funding to secure new flood defence infrastructure.	[Officer interpretation] Consider inclusion of a policy covering environmental infrastructure such as further waste water or flood risk infrastructure.
		LPPD29	Mark Norman, Highways	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			Parts of the strategic road network running through the districts are already close to capacity and cannot reasonably cope with large amounts of additional development without significant improvement. 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. We support the policies in the plan aimed at reducing the need to travel by private car, such as improved walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure, and the provision of high speed broadband allowing people to more easily communicate and work remotely reducing the demand for travel.	None.
		LPPD48	Miss Jane Mower, Estates Programme Manager NHS England and NEECCG and NHSPS	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			[Officer summary] Policies should be explicit in that contributions towards healthcare provision will be obtained and the Local Planning Authority will consider a development's sustainability with regard to effective healthcare provision. The exact nature and scale of the contribution and the subsequent expenditure by NHS England will be calculated at an appropriate time as and when schemes come forward over the plan period to realise the objectives of the DLP. Plans and policies should be revised to ensure that they are specific enough in their aims, but are not in any way prescriptive or binding on NHS England to carry out certain development within a set timeframe, and do not give undue commitment to projects.	There should be a reasonably worded policy within the emerging Local Plan that indicates a supportive approach from the Local Planning Authority to the improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities. This positive stance should also be indicated towards assessing those schemes for new bespoke medical facilities where such facilities are agreed to in writing by NHS England. New facilities will only be appropriate where they accord with the latest up-to-date NHS England and CCG strategy documents.

		LPPD81	Mr John Mason, Carter Jonas	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		[Officer summary] We fully support any upgrading works to the A120, including the construction of a roundabout at the junction of Harwich Road and Park Road (west of Little Bentley). We would like to see better services for drivers and passengers along the route. A new roundabout west of Little Bentley provides an excellent opportunity to provide a local service area for the benefit of all road users. This would provide a convenient stopping/service point between Colchester and Harwich and would be beneficial both from the point of view of servicing existing economic activity in the local and wider areas and generating new economic activity in the local area.	[Officer interpretation] Consider proposals for local service areas on strategic routes like the A120, at Little Bentley.
		LPPD64	Mr David Moseley, Strategic Planner Persimmon Homes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		[Officer summary] Whilst it is agreed that development must be supported by the provision of infrastructure, services and facilities, a significant amount of the items identified rely upon third parties or wider investment decisions. It is important that the totality of costs to be borne by the proposed level of development is adequately assessed. In light of Para 173 of the NPPF, "the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened".	Policy SP5 should be amended to recognise the role the Council's have in terms of influencing, co-ordinating and delivering infrastructure and connectivity. Policy SP5 should also be amended to recognise the role that obligations through s106 or CIL should make in addressing infrastructure needs arising from the new development.
		LPPD88	Phil Bamford, Gladman	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		See Gladman's response to this policy in Colchester's Local Plan.	See Gladman's response to this policy in Colchester's Local Plan.
		LPPD99	Matthew Parsons	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		[Officer summary] Whilst it is agreed that development must be supported by the provision of infrastructure, services and facilities, a significant amount of the items identified rely upon third parties or wider investment decisions. It is important that the totality of costs to be borne by the proposed level of development is adequately assessed. In light of Para 173 of the NPPF, "the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened".	Policy SP5 should be amended to recognise the role the Council's have in terms of influencing, co-ordinating and delivering infrastructure and connectivity. Policy SP5 should also be amended to recognise the role that obligations through s106 or CIL should make in addressing infrastructure needs arising from the new development.

**LPA Response:** The DPDs for each of the garden communities will explore the phasing requirements of the garden community and the associated infrastructure. When read as a whole, there is sufficient reference to the use of planning obligations and CIL, including policies in Section 2 of each plan. Agree that infrastructure includes that related to water. Further work is currently underway in the IWMP which will feed into the DPD process, however the authorities would be happy to consider additional wording in Section 1 as necessary and will continue to work with relevant stakeholders on this point. The wording on education at present has been agreed by the local education authority but additional wording could be explored if considered necessary. The proposed list of minor modifications includes changes by stakeholders proposed to clarify wording on infrastructure including a number by Essex County Council. The Councils understand the requirements for sport, health and leisure facilities in developments, but do not normally consider them as key strategic issues and as such are dealt with in section 2 responses. However the Inspector considers it necessary to add reference to these uses then appropriate wording could be sought. Development of the Infrastructure Delivery Plans has furthered joint working on plan development. In particular, involvement with the IDP by health sector representatives has established good working relationships that will now move forward to future plan making including the DPDs for the Garden Communities. Aside from minor modifications to clarify wording, no other changes are considered necessary to SP5.

CBC rep ID	BD C rep ID	TDC rep ID	Name, Organisation	Legally compliant	Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/ written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan
<b>Policy SP6</b>														
	564		Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	Add a principle: All new development shall minimise lighting effects in the night-time environment through the use of innovative technologies, careful siting and design
6798			Marks Tey Parish Council (PJPC Ltd)	yes	no	yes			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				These principles will clearly be of particular importance for Garden Communities and should be developed through masterplanning, design codes etc. It should be made clear, as noted above, that each phase of any development needs to be sustainable in its own right and add and improve what exists to guard against the development proposals stalling before full completion.	add phase as above
6890			Natural England		no	no				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			The policy should be strengthened to ensure that new development also incorporates biodiversity creation and enhancement into its design. RAMS is a delivery mechanism to mitigate recreational impacts identified through the HRA process from Local Plans as a whole, and not only those arising from the Garden Communities elements of the Plans. Therefore a policy commitment to a RAMS should be made in SP6.	Add wording to ensure new development incorporates biodiversity creation and enhancement into its design. Policy commitment to a RAMS should be made in SP6.
	36		Ms Sue Dobson Bridleways Development Officer Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Paragraph 7.2: we note the Plans aim to create networks of green and blue infrastructure and this paragraph appears to promote use for informal recreation. However, for the Plan to be considered sound, we suggest that access is accessible for ALL users, including equestrians, rather than simply stating, as it does in this paragraph, that they will be for walking links. This will ensure that the Plan can be fully inclusive and not discriminate against one user sector.	Amend the paragraph to incorporate reference to all users, including equestrians.

	37		Ms Sue Dobson Bridleways Development Officer Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		Policy SP6 " Place Shaping Principles: as per the comments on paragraph 7.2, for the Plan to be considered sound, the statement in bullet point 9 should be amended so that it promotes access for ALL users, including equestrians. This will ensure that the Plan is fully inclusive and not discriminate against one user sector.	Amend the paragraph to incorporate reference to fully inclusive access, including equestrians.
6911			Persimmon Homes			no							Officer summary -Use of 'highest' standards too onerous. Should be amended to provide for 'high' standard. All principles stated not applicable to every development. Reword to provide that new development should 'where applicable' reflect principles	Amend to read all new development must be of a 'high' standard and All new development should 'where applicable', reflect the following principles.
	156		Mrs S Osborne	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No		Overdevelopment of rural locations leading loss of rural feel, loss of sense of well being, loss of access to wildlife and risk to biodiversity, risk to protected species Loss of quiet sanctuary . safety concerns increased congestion. increased light , noise and air pollution. There is limited information provided about sustainable green transport methods or deliverability.	consider historical context and infrastructure limitations. Reject west Tey, reject monks farm, reject cook field Significantly reduce housing number allocation for Feering. Being next to a A road isn't sound housing policy planning! The limitations and consequence of high housings numbers placed within a limited area with inherent poor transport infrastructure and residents appreciation for their rural setting needs to be considered. We need to have green belt allocation around Colchester to prevent this complete destruction of the rural community , their lifestyle and the wildlife they share it with. Preserve and protect the Essex way...should be legally protected from development.
6521			Mersea Homes (ADP Ltd)	yes	yes	no		✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	h	yes		The policy uses the superlative adjective 'Highest' which is grammatically incorrect and reduces the effectiveness of the policy. Part 2 of the plan uses "well designed" which is a more meaningful and effect adjective	Delete first sentence and replace with: All new development must be well designed and based on genuine local collaboration (Consequential changes should remove the superlative adjectives). A full comprehensive track change document of the Colchester Local Plan has been submitted to support all representations made by Mersea Homes [6406]. The document has been attached to the representation made on Policy SP1 [ID: 6516] and can be read in conjunction with each representation.



6523		Mersea Homes (ADP Ltd)	yes	yes	no			✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	h	yes	Design codes can play a part in urban design but over dependence on them can make a master plan too rigid creating homogenised layouts lacking the necessary flexibility and variety contained in existing towns and villages. The current increasing speed of change coupled with the long development periods shows plans will need to be adaptive to accommodate change. The plan making process should be process rather than product orientated.	Delete the second sentence and replace with: Design codes have their place in urban design, but their prescriptive nature can run the risk of creating large scale homogenisation often found in new towns. There are other tools which can be deployed using adaptive plans, flexibility, managing complexity and most importantly extensive collaboration with the local community. A full comprehensive track change document of the Colchester Local Plan has been submitted to support all representations made by Mersea Homes [6406]. The document has been attached to the representation made on Policy SP1 [ID: 6515] and can be read in conjunction with each representation.
6525		Mersea Homes (ADP Ltd)	yes	yes	no			✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	h	yes	The section entitled 'all new development should reflect the following principles' is rather generalised and from the perspective of encouraging well designed places it is surpassed by the Part 2 plan's policy DM15: Design and Amenity. It is unhelpful to have two sources of design guidance policy especially as they are different and this situation will cause ongoing confusion.	Delete the section entitled 'All new development should reflect the following principles' and replace with: Place shaping principles will be based on requirements in the individual part 2 local plans or site specific DPD's. A full comprehensive track change document of the Colchester Local Plan has been submitted to support all representations made by Mersea Homes [6406]. The document has been attached to the representation made on Policy SP1 [ID: 6515] and can be read in conjunction with each representation.
6424		CAUSE (Rosie Pearson)	no	yes	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	A	yes	Plan not sound because not positively prepared or effective: -Inability of location to be self-contained: lack of sense of community - Infrastructure budget too low, financial model flawed: likely result is short-cuts in delivery of principles set out in SP6 - location wrong: high commuting  See full CAUSE report: Appendices 2 (Page 18, Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal), 6 (page 50, Providing for Employment) and 9 (page 62, West Tey - the business case)  <a href="http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf">http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf</a>  Also, Colchester Hearing Statement 2008, stating that the location is unsustainable: <a href="http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttphandler.ashx?id=3404&amp;p=0">http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttphandler.ashx?id=3404&amp;p=0</a>	Detailed amendments required are set out in Appendix 1 (page 12 <a href="http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttphandler.ashx?id=3404&amp;p=0">http://www.colchester.gov.uk/CHttphandler.ashx?id=3404&amp;p=0</a> )
	229	Mr Stuart McAdam	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	✓	Yes		Persimmon Homes strongly suggest Braintree is at risk of not being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply during in the course of the plan period and the delivery of sufficient housing within the overall Plan period. The Draft Local Plan does not: -adequately consider increased migration from London - impact of London not meeting its own housing need - Effectively assess key market signals In order to future proof the plan, it is suggested that the Council should seek to allocate reserved sites which can be brought forward if Braintree see an increase in their housing needs	In light of this, SP6 should be amended to read; All new development must be of a high standard of urban and architectural design.

6299		Anglia Water (Stewart Patience)	yes	yes	no				✓			Anglian Water is generally supportive of this policy which sets out the general principles which will be applied to the North Essex Garden Communities. In particular we welcome the references made to the need for water efficiency measures and wastewater infrastructure provision. However it would be helpful if Policy SP6 also includes reference to water supply provision particularly given the scale of the proposed developments.	It is therefore proposed that the tenth criterion of Policy SP6 should be amended as follows:  'Include measures to promote environmental sustainability including addressing energy and water efficiency, and provision of appropriate water and wastewater infrastructure and flood mitigation measures; and'
6272		Marks Tey Church										SP6 is good, especially in prioritising pedestrians etc. (who are currently at risk around Marks Tey). But local Marks Tey people are horrified at the prospect of losing vast swathes of countryside to housing development. If development proposals could include attractive public parks, green and blue spaces, and protection of natural assets (eg Colliers clay quarry area), that would help.	None
6481		West Bergholt Parish Council							<input type="checkbox"/>	yes		West Bergholt PC supports this policy in that our Neighbourhood Plan will require all new development to meet the highest standards of urban and architectural design standards possible.	None
7122		Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting (Fenn Wright)							<input type="checkbox"/>			The Policy wording referred to is disingenuous and unrealistic as the scale of the proposed garden communities makes it impossible to the authorities to comply with the stated policy objective & to preserve and enhance the quality of existing communities and their environs.	None
6869		Martin Robeson			no				✓	h		Policy not consistent with NPPF if requirement is for 'highest standards'. Policy should be amended to replace 'highest' with 'high'.	We are concerned that the policy starts by requiring that all new development "must meet the highest standards of urban and architectural design". The Development Plan must reflect National Policy i.e. in terms of consistency. The policy should be amended to replace 'highest' with 'high'.
	18	Mr Philip Unwin	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Use of vague terms seems to undermine the authority of the various planning departments to ensure any requirements can be identified as actually being delivered.	Reword the document and ensure everyone knows these requirements are a binding part of the plan.
	512	Hills Residential Hills Residential Agent: Mr Kevin Coleman Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	Yes		Policy as drafted is overly onerous and not in accordance with the NPPF, by referring to "the highest" standards of design and architecture. The policy should be rephrased to refer to good design or high quality design, and this objective should be explicitly linked to the bullet points that follow. The preface to the list of bullet points should make clear that each bullet only applies where relevant to the development proposed.	See comments above.
	155	Mr Christopher Bailey Owner Agent: Mr Christopher Bailey Clockhouse Town Planning	Yes	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		This policy merely seeks to replicate previous policies tht have produced poor quality built environment. Reference to cycling provision is a joke.	Start over again recognising the previous negative attitude to development has produced poor a quality built environment. Try and give the next generation reason to proud of us for our work.
	22	Mr Nicholas Carey	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		it is not meeting policy SP 6, "place shaping principles" which states that all new deve should respond positively to local charac and context to preserve and enhance the quality of existing communities and their environs.	The local authority must adhere to the NPPF guidelines as clearly laid down.
	159	Henry Price	No	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	✓	No		Garden communities of necessity create huge amounts of extra light at night-time. This is inconsistent with other LP policies of protecting the natural realm, and against national policy. The LP should include a policy to minimise outdoor lighting at night.	The LP should include a policy to minimise outdoor lighting at night.

189		Mrs Nina Crabb Planning Advisor National Trust Agent: Mrs Nina Crabb	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		This is loosely worded and states that "All new development should reflect the following principles:..." . There is no absolute requirement for these to be provided. There is also no clear threshold for when green infrastructure must be provided or requirements for open space. The issue of open space and green infrastructure is critical to the plan period and specific requirements and thresholds should be included to ensure that adequate provision is made to improve the existing provision and relieve pressure on existing assets. The inclusion of the term where appropriate within in the policy wording (with no definition of when these terms will apply and how) will leave the situations where masterplans and design guides are needed open to question. This will weaken the ability of the District Council to demand excellent quality developments when the sites come forward for development.	The National Trusts view is that this Policy is not clearly worded enough to adequately set out when green infrastructure will be required. A set threshold or definition of the terms used is required.
510		Ms Alex Stevenson	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No		The plan should include in its figures and maps the green buffer between existing settlements and proposed new settlements . Then reduce accordingly the area of purple shading which could be interpreted in the future as the extent of the garden towns. If this does not happen there will be a contradiction between the text and the maps which could be exploited in the future by developers councils who want to extend the envelope of existing or new settlements.	The plan should include in its figures and maps the green buffer between existing settlements and proposed new settlements . Then reduce accordingly the area of purple shading which could be interpreted in the future as the extent of the garden towns. If this does not happen there will be a contradiction between the text and the maps which could be exploited in the future by developers councils who want to extend the envelope of existing or new settlements.
6549		Campaign to Protect Rural Essex	yes	no	no			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	h		West of Braintree, the integrity of existing settlements, such as, Rayne and Stebbing is under great threat from the proximity of the proposals for large scale developments on their borders. The West Tey GC proposal would lead to the virtual merging of Marks Tey with Coggeshall and Feering. Under this scenario, there needs to be greater emphasis placed on the importance of recognising and protecting the integrity of existing places.	The role of "Green Buffers" in preserving the character of existing settlements and protecting them from agglomeration will be critical in this respect. However, to ensure that the purpose of "Green Buffers" is fully understood and implemented successfully, a full definition is required. For example, it needs to be made clear whether these buffers are merely narrow landscaped strips or more substantial swathes of land and whether they can include existing buildings in the landscape - such as those related agriculture and sports facilities.
6105		Richard Waylen	yes	yes	no		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			w		Perhaps a completely different view should be considered. Colchester Town Centre has deteriorated over the past 10 years, with many empty units (notably loss of the Co-Op complex). Why not let the town die / replace shop units with housing (brown field development) and allow natural expansion in retail units at edge of town (Stanway, Hythe, Northern Gateway). Chelmsfor and Ipswich provide far better retail experience for customers	The town is dying, and attempt to reinvent the town centre and money spent in the high street restructuring have been wasted. A completely new approach is needed linking more effectively with other centres particularly Chelmsford

6366		Wivenhoe Town Council	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	A		<p>Building 9,000 dwellings across 4 villages does not - at any imaginable level - respond to local character</p> <p>Density should not exceed 60 units per hectare</p> <p>There should be sufficient space left to mitigate for the much more realistic outcome that private car ownership will increase. This plan must exhibit a degree of 'common-sense' or else it will fail to be accepted by local communities. It will also fail its future residents.</p> <p>Minimum standards on size for dwellings.</p>	<p>There should be sufficient space left to mitigate for the much more realistic outcome that private car ownership will increase.</p> <p>If the aim of this plan is to preserve the quality of local communities then the simple option is not to build at this scale.</p> <p>Land around Wivenhoe to the South of the A133 needs to be placed into a Trust or comparable locally orientated vessel to prevent coalescence.</p> <p>The importance of minimum room sizes, adequate parking and gardens dictates that there must be agreed standards before this plan is approved.</p> <p>Not all agricultural land on the site should be lost. the priority should be given to the private car as anything else will NOT work.</p> <p>Density should not exceed 60 units per hectare. In addition, the higher density areas should be built to the north of the site and away from existing communities.</p>
7125		Hopkins Homes (Pegasus Group, Nicky Parsons)	yes	yes	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	✓	h	yes	<p>The policy is overly prescriptive in relation to design, public realm, parking and green/blue infrastructure. It also fails to define blue infrastructure either in this policy or elsewhere in the plan. These elements of the policy lack justification, are inconsistent with national policy and prejudice the effectiveness of the plan.</p>	<p>To overcome this objection the following changes are requested: delete the second bullet point, replace the word and with the word or in the sixth bullet point, amend the eighth bullet point to read 'where parking is proposed it should be well integrated as part of the overall design and be adaptable if levels of private car ownership fall', define what blue infrastructure means, amend the ninth bullet point to add 'and that is appropriate to the nature and scale of development proposed and in line with policies ENV3 and DM18'.</p>
7157		Pegasus (Nicky Parsons) for Bloor Homes Eastern	yes	yes	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	✓	h		<p>The policy is overly prescriptive in relation to design, public realm, parking and green/blue infrastructure. It also fails to define blue infrastructure either in this policy or elsewhere in the Plan. These elements of the policy lack justification, are inconsistent with national policy and prejudice the effectiveness of the Plan.</p>	<p>To overcome this objection, the following changes are requested:* Delete the second bullet point* Replace the word 'and' with the word 'or' in the sixth bullet point* Amend the eighth bullet point to read 'Where parking is proposed it should be Include parking facilities that are well integrated as part of the overall design and are be adaptable if levels of private car ownership fall'* Define what blue infrastructure means* Amend the ninth bullet point to read 'Provide an integrated network of multi-functional public open space and green and blue infrastructure that connects with existing green infrastructure where possible and that is appropriate to the nature and scale of development proposed and in line with policies ENV3 and DM18'</p>

	245		Environment Agency Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No			We recommend that bullet point 11 should include a reference to the promotion of sustainable drainage systems along the following lines: Include measures to promote environmental sustainability including addressing energy and water efficiency, and provision of appropriate wastewater and flood mitigation measures, including use of open space for sustainable drainage systems.
7143			Sport England ( Maggie Taylor)			no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Sport England supports the principles related to creating well connected places that prioritise the needs of pedestrians/cyclists and provide an integrated network of multi-functional public open space to help encourage healthy and active lifestyles. They are consistent with Sport England's and Public Health England's Active Design guidance principles <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/active-design/">https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/active-design/</a> The review of the Essex Design Guide, supported by Sport England will be a material consideration in assessing the quality of the design of new developments. The Active Design principles will be embedded into the guidance. Local plan policies should be consistent with the Essex Design Guide.	While the policy is broadly supported, to complement its implementation it is requested that reference is made in the policy's supporting text to the Active Design guidance as this would provide more detail about how the relevant place making principles could be applied in practice. This addition would improve the soundness of the plan both in relation to meeting the 'justified' and consistent with national policy' tests
6113			2008 Angora Bare Trusts										We support the broad objectives of this policy and believe that additional criteria could be reflected in the policy wording. For example, emphasizing the need to create local connections and also, where appropriate, taking local opportunities for environmental enhancements to an area through for example, removing traffic congestion spots, removing eyesores, establishing new open spaces and so forth.	
6428			RSPB	yes	yes		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			The RSPB welcomes the environmental aspirations of this policy to conserve and enhance assets..of natural value and to seek an integrated network of green and blue infrastructure across new developments.	
6444			Andrew Martin Planning (representing R F West)							<input type="checkbox"/>				
6490			Andrew Martin Planning (representing Crest Nicholson)							<input type="checkbox"/>			Support is extended for the objective to meet the highest standards of urban and architectural design in all new development. It is recognised that strategic scale developments may require the use of development frameworks, masterplans and design codes to guide new development. Crest Nicholson Operations Ltd would, in the course of preparing a planning application package for land at East Marks Tey, engage with the Council and its advisors on matters of design. Consideration has already been given to matters of landscaping and open space and the likely visual impact of the development	
6940			Historic England										Officer summary -Historic England welcomes reference to protecting and enhancing the historic assets. June 2016 draft local plan comments suggested that first bullet point clarified to read: "...enhance the quality of existing places" rather than "communities." Caution needed in implementing the policy on adding street furniture to guard against the unmanaged and indiscriminate use of street furniture such as signs, benches, bins etc in the historic environment.	
7025			Andrew Granger & Co. (Mr Adam Murray)										Support for the inclusion of Place Farm (Rowhedge Road, Colchester) Full text highlights that the site is capable of being designed in line with SP6.	

96		Mrs Julie Marshall	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Environmentally it will be a disaster to build on ancient woodland, agricultural land and the airfield. We should be protecting our countryside not building on it. The proposal will overwhelm Stebbing, Saling and Blake End villages and I fear there will be knock on effects to Shalford, Panfield, Wethersfield and Finchingfield. It is totally unfair to inflict this kind of excessive building on our local communities. It is possible that leaving the EU could mean that demand for housing will fall in the future. If large numbers of EU workers leave the area then these garden villages could be white elephants.
177		Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		7.2 Networks of green and blue infrastructure should be provided across new developments, linking new developments within existing networks of open space. These areas can be multi use, providing space for natural species and habitats as well as space for informal recreation and walking links. What if you are colour blind! West of Braintree - reference above statement - why spoil something that we already have? Anyone from Braintree and the surrounds can come now and enjoy the open space and many do. from the evidence of the number of cycling clubs that use our narrow lanes. If West of Braintree goes ahead this will be spoilt for 1000s. What will our children and grandchildren do then... poor things:-)
548		Mr Phil Bamford Planning Manager Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		OS - Speed of delivering garden communities, means a shortfall in supply across the plan which needs further allocations.
50		Mr Stephen Walsh vice chairman Unex Group Holdings Limited Agent: Mr Greg Pearce Senior Planner David Lock Associates	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	4633504	Supports the Place Shaping Principles in Policy SP6.
53		Sport England Sport England Planning Manager Eastern Region Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No		O/S - Policy is broadly supported, reference should be made to Active Design Guidance.
75		Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		WoB will not be a Quality Place to live it will be a dormitory Town with no sole
132		Mrs Julie Marshall	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Environmentally it will be a disaster to build on ancient woodland, agricultural land and the airfield. We should be protecting our countryside not building on it. The proposal will overwhelm Stebbing, Saling and Blake End villages and I fear there will be knock on effects to Shalford, Panfield, Wethersfield and Finchingfield. It is totally unfair to inflict this kind of excessive building on our local communities
213		Mr Peter Williams Director Williams Group Agent: Mrs Teresa Cook Principal Consultant Emery Planning Partnership Ltd	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The strategic expansion of Braintree town to the south-east promoted by the Williams Group would provide an opportunity for the design and place shaping principles to be applied to the new area, to ensure that it achieved a high quality environment in which to work, live or visit. The principles articulated in Policy SP6 are therefore supported.

	369		Ms Debbie Morgan Clerk Coggeshall Parish Council	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	4666880	Policy SP6 Place Shaping Principles The first sentence is very loose - how do BDC propose to "meet highest standards of urban and architectural design"? Design codes are mentioned but are not specific - CNP suggests mentioning the Essex Design Guide and local Town and Parish Design Guidelines? Garden communities. Coggeshall, Feering and Kelvedon Neighbourhood plan steering groups have met and noted an area of great concern to us all regarding green buffers and coalescence. Each Neighbourhood plan will submit separately but we have common concerns about Policies SP 7 and 9 and LPP 72.	
	413		Mr Peter Kohn Chariman Coggeshall Neighbourhood Plan Committee	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		Policy SP6 Place Shaping Principles The first sentence is very loose - how do BDC propose to "meet highest standards of urban and architectural design"? Design codes are mentioned but are not specific - CNP suggests mentioning the Essex Design Guide and local Town and Parish Design Guidelines? Garden communities. Coggeshall, Feering and Kelvedon Neighbourhood plan steering groups have met and noted an area of great concern to us all regarding green buffers and coalescence. Each Neighbourhood plan will submit separately but we have common concerns about Policies SP 7 and 9 and LPP 72.	
	525		Consultation Service Natural England	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		OFFICER RESPONSE: The policy should be strengthened to ensure that new development also incorporates biodiversity creation and enhancement into its design. The aspiration of net gain in biodiversity is clearly presented in paragraph 109 of the NPPF, yet is only described in Policy SP 7. It is our view that the policies for open space in Policy SP 6 needs to be strengthened, to mirror the safeguards in the Section 2 plans. This is recommended at paragraph 6.98 of the Appropriate Assessment (AA) Section 1 Report.	
	642		Dr Natalie Gates Principal Advisor, Historic Places Team Historic England	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered		O/S Historic England welcomes the reference to protecting and enhancing the historic assets.  In relation to the principle to "enhance the public realm...through additional street furniture..." there will need to be some caution in implementing the policy as worded to guard against the unmanaged and indiscriminate use of street furniture such as signs, benches, bins etc in the historic environment. Without careful control, there can be a detrimental impact on the setting of historic buildings and the character of conservation areas.	
		LPPD23	Mr Andrew Hunter, Planning Advisor - Sustainable Places Team Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			[Officer summary] The supporting text makes reference to the ecological benefits of open space but there is no reference to the benefits of open space to sustainable drainage.	Point 11 should include a reference to the promotion of sustainable drainage systems along the following lines: "Include measures to promote environmental sustainability including addressing energy and water efficiency, and provision of appropriate wastewater and flood mitigation measures, including use of open space for sustainable drainage systems".
		LPPD33	Historic Environment Planning Adviser, Historic England	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			Historic England welcomes the reference to protecting and enhancing the historic assets. We suggest that the first bullet point of the policy is clarified to read: "...enhance the quality of existing places" rather than "communities." In relation to the principle to "enhance the public realm...through additional street furniture..." there will need to be some caution in implementing the policy as worded to guard against the unmanaged and indiscriminate use of street furniture such as signs, benches, bins etc in the historic environment. Without careful control, there can be a detrimental impact on the setting of historic buildings and the character of conservation areas.	
		LPPD35	Historic Environment Planning Adviser, Historic England	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			The first sentence of each of these paragraphs are the same. (Para 1.100)	
		LPPD91	Mr D E Casey MBE	Yes		No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			[Officer summary] The Tendring Colchester Border Garden Community map has no key. The proposal appears effectively desecrate the Salary Brook Valley which has a delightful character of its own and is a natural beauty spot of great landscape and ecological significance. The whole of this area is a high quality green belt locality and should, in conjunction with CBC be turned into a Country Park to be protected in perpetuity for the people of Colchester and North Essex.	[Officer interpretation] Designate Salary Brook Valley as a Country Park.

	LPPD73	Richard Clews, Associate Planner Strutt and Parker	Response withheld	Response withheld	No	✓	✓	✓	✓		[Officer summary] Policy SP6 all new development to meet the highest standards of urban and architectural design but policies LP2, LP3 and LP4 set more specific requirements in Tendring which could be incompatible with the high bar set out in Policy SP6. There should either be a clear separation in which policies will apply to development in different locations, or an amendment to SP6 to remove the high bar for standards of architectural design. As currently drafted, SP6 is not consistent with National Policy. The Council explicitly seeks to embrace Garden City Principles within all development in the District (paragraph 5.4.2) but these will not be appropriate in all situations and that this approach may result in an inefficient use of land, particularly around transport hubs and the most sustainable settlements. An approach that favours one type of layout over another is not considered to fully embrace the emphasis in SP6 or the expectations of paragraph 65 of the NPPF.	Provide greater clarity as to how the Strategic Polices in Section 1 and the Local Policies set out in Section 2 will be applied to planning applications.
	LPPD75	Richard Clews, Associate Planner Strutt and Parker	Response withheld	Response withheld	No	✓	✓	✓	✓		[Officer summary] Policy SP6 all new development to meet the highest standards of urban and architectural design but policies LP2, LP3 and LP4 set more specific requirements in Tendring which could be incompatible with the high bar set out in Policy SP6. There should either be a clear separation in which policies will apply to development in different locations, or an amendment to SP6 to remove the high bar for standards of architectural design. As currently drafted, SP6 is not consistent with National Policy. The Council explicitly seeks to embrace Garden City Principles within all development in the District (paragraph 5.4.2) but these will not be appropriate in all situations and that this approach may result in an inefficient use of land, particularly around transport hubs and the most sustainable settlements. An approach that favours one type of layout over another is not considered to fully embrace the emphasis in SP6 or the expectations of paragraph 65 of the NPPF.	Provide greater clarity as to how the Strategic Polices in Section 1 and the Local Policies set out in Section 2 will be applied to planning applications.
	LPPD65	Mr David Moseley, Strategic Planner Persimmon Homes	Yes	Yes	Yes						[Officer summary] Policy SP6 all new development to meet the highest standards of urban and architectural design but policies LP2, LP3 and LP4 set more specific requirements in Tendring which could be incompatible with the high bar set out in Policy SP6. There should either be a clear separation in which policies will apply to development in different locations, or an amendment to SP6 to remove the high bar for standards of architectural design. As currently drafted, SP6 is not consistent with National Policy. The Council explicitly seeks to embrace Garden City Principles within all development in the District (paragraph 5.4.2) but these will not be appropriate in all situations and that this approach may result in an inefficient use of land, particularly around transport hubs and the most sustainable settlements. An approach that favours one type of layout over another is not considered to fully embrace the emphasis in SP6 or the expectations of paragraph 65 of the NPPF.	Provide greater clarity as to how the Strategic Polices in Section 1 and the Local Policies set out in Section 2 will be applied to planning applications.
	LPPD97	Martin Robeson, Martin Robeson Planning Practice	Yes	Yes	No				✓		[Officer summary] Requiring all new developments to meet the highest standards of urban and architectural design is inappropriate bearing in mind the NPPF only requires 'high quality' or 'good' design. The Development Plan must reflect National Policy i.e. in terms of consistency. The vision for the area also refers to 'high quality homes' and other policies refer to 'high standards of design and layout'.	Amend the policy to replace "highest" with "high".
	LPPD100	Matthew Parsons, Persimmon Homes	Yes	Yes	Yes						[Officer summary] Requiring every development to meet the highest standards of urban and architectural design is a more onerous test than the 'high quality and inclusive design' required by the NPPF. The constant escalation to achieve the highest possible standards could threaten development viability. Not all of the principles would be applicable to every development. For example, it may not be desirable to provide a mix of uses in some developments and some might not be of a scale to achieve or require an integrated network of multi-functional public open space.	SP6 should be amended to read; "All new development must be of a high standard of urban and architectural design". SP6 should be amended to read; "All new development should, where applicable, reflect the following principles;"

**LPA Response:** A number of representations to this section on creating quality places have been detailed. The section 1 of the Local Plans contains strategic policies only. Some matters raised are considered beyond the scope of the strategic place shaping principle policy. These more detailed issues may be dealt with in the section 2 Local Plans in site specific or development management policies, or would be more appropriate to be considered through SPD, DPD or masterplanning and planning application approaches. The policies are considered to be flexibly worded to support developments that are of an appropriate mix, layout and density for their location, with further detail provided in the authorities' Section 2 policies and will also be developed for the Garden Communities Development Plan Documents. The specific wording used to define the quality of design standards can be considered through the examination process. Natural England's support for our section 2 policies is noted where biodiversity policies are set out in detail. However if a reference in the strategic policy is required this could be in point 9 of the Plan. Minor modifications requesting wording clarification on application of standards, and to add in reference to active design principles and water infrastructure are supported along with inclusion of a definition of blue infrastructure in the Glossary. Aside from minor modifications, no other changes to SP6 are considered necessary.



CBC rep ID	BD C rep ID	TDC rep ID	Name, Organisation		Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/ written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan
				Legally compliant										
<b>Policy SP7</b>														
6107			Richard Waylen	yes	yes	yes					w		I do not believe that sufficient Infrastructure will be provided to relieve existing congestion and provide for these new communities	Guarantees on infrastructure before new housing
6114			2008 Angora Bare Trusts	yes	yes	no			✓		h		We have no particular view on the merits of this policy or otherwise but we are very conscious of the timescales involved in actual delivery of housing via new communities such as those being proposed. This raises questions over the likely housing contribution during the remaining Local Plan period (2017-33) and the Local Plan as a whole, and Policy SP7, should acknowledge this and offer a mechanism to ensure that overall housing supply is maintained throughout the plan period (see also Policy SP3 response above).	Review mechanism required in respect of actual delivery
6163			The University of Essex (The JTS Partnership)										The University supports the 'principles' set out in Policy SP7 and, in particular, the need to ensure that development and infrastructure is 'sequenced', with the latter being provided ahead of, or in tandem with, new development.	None
6261			Diocese of Chelmsford (Church of England)	yes	yes	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	h		Policy SP7 (viii) is not compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework because it does not mention places of worship. Section 70 of the NPPF states: "To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should: plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments."	For Policy SP7 to be sound "places of worship" needs to be included in the list of community services and facilities at (viii). Since the NPPF specifically mentions "places of worship" this policy SP7 (viii) should also specifically mention "places of worship" as it cannot be assumed that "places of worship" are included if they are not mentioned.
6265			Diocese of Chelmsford (Church of England)				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			I support the statement in SP7 "The design, development and phased delivery of each new garden community will conform with the following principles (i) Community and stakeholder empowerment in the design and delivery of each garden community from the outset and a long-term engagement and activation strategy". I have listed the names of 4 local clergy who are local community leaders and I would like them included in early discussions about the Strategic Growth DPD of the new communities and all subsequent discussions leading to the development of more detailed masterplans for the new garden communities.	None

6279		Wivenhoe Town Council	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	A	With reference to the 'North Essex Garden Communities LDV and funding requirements 1 -The contingency is ludicrously too low at 5% for this kind of project. This leads to speculation (also made within the Kerslake Review) that those planning it are unqualified to do so and are being wildly over ambitious. 2 - Allowances for infrastructure are too low 3 - There is no evidence that a sound financial risk assessment has been completed As for transport; the policy of 'promoting more sustainable travel patterns' is unsound because there is no evidence it will work.	The financial aspects, with particular reference to the inconceivably low contingency must be addressed. The assumptions must be removed before any element of this plan can genuinely be considered feasible. Car ownership will not diminish and behaviour change is exceptionally unlikely with zero evidence base that this is a true possibility. The plan needs to shift focus from the implausible to the practical and account for the real transport issues created by private car ownership. We do not see the evidence that this level of housing growth is justified in North Essex and the volume of dwellings proposed (9,000 up to 2048) needs to be significantly reduced. Local stakeholders must have a real say in shaping this plan as we have been completely sidestepped. To this end land around Wivenhoe to the South of the A133 needs to be placed into a Trust or comparable locally orientated vessel to prevent coalescence.
6300		Anglia Water (Stewart Patience)	yes	yes	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	A	Anglian Water is generally supportive of Policy SP7 but would wish to see the wording relating to water efficiency amended to make it effective.	It is therefore proposed that the wording of Policy SP 7 should be amended as follows:  '(xi) Secure a smart and sustainable approach that fosters climate resilience and a 21st century environment in the design and construction of each garden community to secure net gains in local biodiversity, highest standards of energy efficiency and innovation in technology to reduce impact of climate change, the incorporation of innovative water efficiency/re-use measures (with the aim of being water neutral in as an identified areas of serious water stress), and sustainable waste and mineral management.'  There will also be a need for consequential amendments to Policies SP 8, 9 and 10 for consistency with the changes as set out above.
6345		Wivenhoe Society	yes	yes	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	A	No housing need evidence is provided for the proposed post 2033 growth. No rationale is given for the choice of sites. The West Tendring site will do little to promote growth of Tendring's economy and will effectively be a suburb of Colchester. The possibility of a site further to the east does not appear to have been adequately researched. For the two sites nearest to Colchester there is no discussion as to whether it is sensible to embark on both of these simultaneously. No evidence is provided that a "step change" in sustainable transport is possible.	justification of sites chosen and evidence of post 2033 housing need
6394		Highways England									Whilst we recognise these are long term proposals they are dependent upon improvements to the A12 and A120 coming forward and the comments about the need for jobs, housing services, facilities and infrastructure coming ahead as the need develops is critical if a sustainable development is to be delivered. There is a strong interdependence between these proposals and	None

													the improvements to the A12 and A120 and it will be essential that we work together to achieve our strategic objectives and ensure the evidence base is robust..	
6425		CAUSE (Rosie Pearson)	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	A	yes		<p>We set out our concerns in full in the CAUSE representation:  <a href="http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf">http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf</a></p> <p>This report explains why the decision to include three new garden settlements in the Local Plan is unsound, with papers as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Detailed amendments required</li> <li>2. Comments on Sustainability Appraisal</li> <li>3. New towns: learning from the past</li> <li>4. Positive vision for north Essex</li> <li>5. OAN - unnecessary uplifts applied</li> <li>6. Providing for employment</li> <li>7. Rail constraints</li> <li>8. Connectivity &amp; infrastructure</li> <li>9. Viability: West Tey's business case</li> <li>10. West Tey: Costs &amp; Risks</li> <li>11. The deal for land-owners</li> <li>12. Community engagement</li> </ol> <p>*NB documents attached</p>	See Appendix 1 (page 12 <a href="http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf">http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf</a> )
6431		CPREssex	yes	yes	no	✓	✓	✓		w			<p>Delivery mechanism needs to be established before garden communities included in the plan.</p> <p>Not certain necessary road and rail improvements can be secured ahead of development.</p>	Inclusion of garden communities in plan to be contingent on establishment of delivery vehicle and securing of necessary road and rail improvements.
6432		RSPB				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓				The RSPB supports the principle outlined in point x), in particular the reference to "enhancing biodiversity", which is consistent with national policy.	None
6468		Cllr Peter Chillingworth	yes	yes	no	✓				w	yes		<p>West Tey inclusion in the Plan is premature, because of;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No economic base</li> <li>2. No certainty regarding transport infrastructure, especially A120</li> <li>3. Same applies to railways improvements, health facilities, etc.</li> <li>4. Managing 2 LDVs is over ambitious, do East Colchester first to gain expertise.</li> <li>5. Low quality agricultural land should be developed at Middlewick before high quality at West Tey.</li> <li>6. South Colchester should be developed to release funds for necessary transport infrastructure before greenfield land to the west of Colchester.</li> </ol>	Delete West Tey
6492		Andrew Martin (representing Crest Nicholson)	yes	yes	no	✓	✓	✓		A	yes		<p>The principle of the development of new Garden Communities is sound, but objection is raised to proposals for their delivery.</p> <p>The Lord Kerslake Peer Review highlighted concerns regarding proposed LDVs. It recommended that councils explore alternative models and funding options and consider a collaborative venture with a developer or strategic finance partner.</p> <p>The Plan should be amended to allow for an early phase of growth at East Marks Tey and an alternative to the LDV in the term of a collaborative venture with a developer or strategic finance partner.</p>	Amend to allow for an early phase of growth of the Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community on land at East Marks Tey. This should be identified as both a free-standing allocation for growth in the short term and as a first phase of the proposed new Garden Community in the longer term. There should be a cross reference a specific allocation in Section 2 of the Plan for Colchester, its identification on the Proposals Map and within the housing trajectory for delivery in the early years of the Plan. The Plan should be amended to consider an alternative to the LDV in the form of a collaborative venture with a strategic partner - such as Crest - who supports the principles that the Council wants to promote.

6591		Mersea Homes (APD Ltd)	yes	no	yes			✓		h	yes	The Councils are proposing new delivery models which involve new Council controlled companies acquiring the necessary land and undertaking the planning application process. However, the policy does not make it clear what happens if this objective fails. For example, would policy allow the projects to be completed by the private sector? Whilst supporting the Councils' proposal for new delivery models this matter is of pivotal importance as it deals with the prospect of under delivery of new development over the next plan period or the viability of the plan itself and needs to be resolved at the Examination in Public.	Add the following to sub paragraph ii: In the event of the new delivery models proposed by the councils are not achieved all or some of the proposed developments may be undertaken by the private sector. A full comprehensive track change document of the Colchester Local Plan has been submitted to support all representations made by Mersea Homes [6406]. The document has been attached to the representation made on Policy SP1 [ID: 6515] and can be read in conjunction with each representation.
6592		Mersea Homes (APD Ltd)	yes	no	yes			✓		h	yes	Social and economic change is occurring at an increasing rate therefore plan making must adapt by facilitating both business and public collaboration. Master plans should set a direction of travel rather than being over prescriptive thereby facilitating ongoing adaptability.	Add the following paragraph: The delivery body shall be responsible for facilitating comprehensive public and business participation in the creation of the new Garden Communities from the outset. They will ensure master planning is flexible with structured ongoing reviews to ensure the continued adaptability of the plan A full comprehensive track change document of the Colchester Local Plan has been submitted to support all representations made by Mersea Homes [6406]. The document has been attached to the representation made on Policy SP1 [ID: 6515] and can be read in conjunction with each representation.
6643		Highways England										I note that transport modelling work has been carried out for the town centre sites this is welcomed. However, there appears to have been no cumulative impact assessment carried out of the impact of development in the villages. I am particularly concerned the impact on junctions on the A12 to the North of Colchester and the A120 could be severe. Particularly as growth is likely to come forward toward the front of the local plan period as the garden villages are reliant upon major improvements to both the A120 and A12 to come forward.	None
6352		Alexandra Woolmore	no	yes	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	w		Objection on the grounds that the three new settlements are not justified, certainly not at the proposed scale, and that the Council has not engaged with the public in positive plan making to develop the proposals. There has been little assessment of the alternatives, and the Council has not taken suggestions of other groups and individuals seriously. There is no certainty over the deliverability of the infrastructure required to support the settlements or the quality of the developments as places to live and work.	In my view, this aspect of the plan is unsound and the Council(s) need to start again in terms of their engagement with the community and the numbers proposed. At the very least, the policy needs to be supported by a plan which clearly shows the development area, both falling within this plan period and the longer term, and an indicative masterplan. This should not be deferred to a later stage when the principle of the development is set.
6636		Bardfield Saling Parish Meeting (Fenn Wright)	yes	no	no			✓		h		The Policy is aspirational but unrealistic and does not provide clear basis for decision making having regard to the burden of necessary viability and delivery obligations	Delete Policy and rewrite Policy's SP8,9 and 10 to include specific design and infrastructure requirements applicable to each Garden Community Master Plan.

6550		Campaign to Protect Rural Essex	yes	yes	no		✓	✓		h		We support the proposed LDV and believe that a model, owned and led by a consortium of local authorities rather than traditional developers, allows for tighter control over development and the phasing of proposals for new communities across north Essex. However, the sheer scale of these proposals for three concurrent garden communities raises real concern about the ability and capacity of the new development company to manage and deliver all that is proposed in Section One of the Plan. As such, the effectiveness of the Plan is immediately called into doubt.	We support the proposed LDV and believe that a model, owned and led by a consortium of local authorities rather than traditional developers, allows for tighter control over development and the phasing of proposals for new communities across north Essex. However, the sheer scale of these proposals for three concurrent garden communities raises real concern about the ability and capacity of the new development company to manage and deliver all that is proposed in Section One of the Plan. As such, the effectiveness of the Plan is immediately called into doubt.
6656		Highways England										Whilst we recognise these are long term proposals they are dependent upon improvements to the A12 and A120 coming forward and the comments about the need for jobs, housing services, facilities and infrastructure coming ahead as the need develops is critical if a sustainable development is to be delivered. There is 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 evidence base is robust.	None
6745		Mike Lambert	no	no	no		✓	✓		h	yes	Plan is not justified; not effective; premature (because the GC specific DPDs have not yet been produced); Sustainability Appraisal and supporting evidence does not justify scale.	Delete. Beyond the commitment to the 7500 in Policy SP2 there is no justification at this stage for a commitment to NGCs of the size and scale proposed.
6777		Mersea Homes (APD Ltd)	yes	no	yes		✓			h	yes	The Council proposes to increase the percentage of affordable housing from 20% to 30% which is a significant step change and, we believe, not supported by objective evidence. A report is attached prepared by Thomas Hegan MRICS., Turner Morum Chartered Surveyors. It concludes: &quot;I believe there are a number of insufficient cost inputs adopted within the 3-Dragon viability analysis which have a serious bearing on respective viability conclusions..... As a result I believe that the 30% should therefore be reduced to 25%.&quot;	To reduce the affordable housing delivery percentage from 30% to 25%. A full comprehensive track change document of the Colchester Local Plan has been submitted to support all representations made by Mersea Homes [6406]. The document has been attached to the representation made on Policy SP1 [ID: 6515] and can be read in conjunction with each representation.
6799		Marks Tey Parish Council (PJPC Ltd)	yes	no	yes	✓		✓	✓	h		This overarching policy should include the guiding Garden Communities principles. The criteria set out can then refer to these and flow from them and should enable them to be set out more clearly and succinctly. The need for the timely provision of necessary infrastructure should be more made clearer and underlined as a fundamental element of each phase of development as should the need to include contingency measures should delivery not proceed as anticipated. Considerations of impacts and relationships with adjoining communities is also fundamental as is a guide to the final size of the Garden Communities.	Include specific reference to the Garden Community principles and relate the detailed criteria set out to these with more clarity; add references to need for necessary infrastructure to be up front and phasing / implementation plan to ensure each stage is self-sustaining. Clear criteria for planned size of the Garden Communities
6817		William Sunnucks	no	no	yes		✓	✓	✓	h		Neither of the two key decisions in this policy have been justified. 1) Proper justification is needed for the choice of garden communities as a development format which will deliver more infrastructure. 2) The choice of location for the communities takes no account of economic viability, infrastructure or jobs. I support CAUSE's response.	Include one garden community, not three. Drop West Tey and West of Braintree. Pursue East Colchester, but Clingoe Hill needs to remain as a green corridor and a proper transport plan is needed first.

6891		Natural England			no						Principles regarding natural environment welcomed, but green infrastructure should be delivered according to a set of defined standards, ie use of Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards. Need to identify how net gain in local biodiversity is to be achieved - refer to priorities/targets in Essex Biodiversity Action Plan. Garden Community masterplanning should achieve enhancement and incorporation of biodiversity.	More guidance on biodiversity should be included, but no specific wording provided
6912		Persimmon Homes			no						Officer Summary - Persimmon support the creation of the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community. Affordable housing target of 30% shouldn't be referred to as a minimum. Uncapped target does not provide certainty. Persimmon site at St. Johns is deliverable, available and suitable and should be identified as either part of the Garden Community or a separate site in its own right.	Specific wording not provided, but change wording on affordable housing to remove 'minimum'. Provide specific allocation for St. John's Road site either in Garden Community or as site in its own right.
6942		Historic England									Officer summary - HE remain concerned that there has not been a demonstrable consideration of the impact of Garden Communities on the historic environment. Plan should contain a framework to guide how boundaries and extent of garden communities are determined. Historic Impact Assessments should be undertaken. Appropriate criteria for protection of heritage assets and settings needs to be included.	inclusion of an additional criterion in Policy SP7, to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment in accordance with our advice note 3 Site Allocations in Local Plans in order to assess impact of the proposed allocation upon the historic environment, to inform the appropriate extent of the development and establish any mitigation measures necessary. This might include appropriate safeguarding buffers around heritage assets such as historic parks and gardens, scheduled monuments, conservation areas and listed buildings and identify how the historic environment and heritage assets can form part of the development of successful schemes.
7012		Peter Kay, C-Bus								yes	Properly intelligible evidence must be submitted as to the traffic impacts of the garden communities.	

7016		Deborah Talbot			no		✓	✓		A		<p>*Officers summary:  -OAHN not properly assessed  -documents not accessibly written  -concerns over the legal loopholes in relation to the garden communities</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A proper assessment of local housing need, and a scaling back of plans to ensure a proper balance of density and green spaces/community facilities.</li> <li>2. A proper consideration of future economic forecasting.</li> <li>3. A properly worked through plan that assesses economic growth.</li> <li>4. A proper consideration of more innovative design, which includes community building, economic growth and commercial activity. Houses don't produce growth in and of themselves.</li> <li>5. Provide a document that is accessible to all residents.</li> </ol> <p>*Officer NB :Commentary submitted for section two of the Local Plan however not against any policy; interpreted that the most appropriate place for the commentary is SP7 as which garden community is not considered. Response received as word doc titled 'Garden Village Response'.</p>
7017		Colchester Chamber of Commerce										<p>We do not propose to comment further on the draft plans. *Officers interpretation of full text: - General support for the principle of garden communities including the general desire for North Essex to grow a strong economy. -The full text outlines several points that are considered to be important to note in the implementation of the garden communities including timely and relevant infrastructure.</p>	
7039		Cushman and Wakefield									yes	<p>Whilst we appreciate that there is ongoing work on the nature and form of the proposed garden-communities, it is not clear from the local plan, nor indeed Policy SP7, of the supporting nonresidential infrastructure which will be considered appropriate as part of the wider delivery of new homes. It is reasonable to presume that these garden-communities, in providing a 'holistically and comprehensively planned new community' will involve the provision of ancillary facilities, including retail and leisure uses alongside food and drink development. Whilst there is mention of supporting mixes of uses in district centre/local centres, no further guidance is given.</p>	
7050		Boyer Planning			yes						yes	<p>We support policies SP7 and SP9. Our client's land is located within the broad area of search for the Colchester/Braintree Garden Community. It is noted that a Strategic Growth DPD will set out the nature, form and boundary of the new community, and will provide the framework for a more detailed masterplan. As set out in our previous representations, given the proximity to existing residential development and the sustainable location of our client's land, it would be well positioned to form part of the residential provision for the new garden community.</p>	
7082		Mr & Mrs A Morgan			no		✓					<p>Predicted growth figures not justified nor sustainable. Colchester has grown so much in recent years and housing figures to provide for local people rather than a huge increase from outside is sufficient.</p>	<p>Reduce the rate of growth in housing numbers over the next 20 years to less than the recent historical rate and avoid expanding the Borough on the periphery, particularly not joining Colchester town to Wivenhoe and Tendring district.</p>
7092		Dept Education, Skills and Funding	yes	yes	yes							<p>The ESFA also welcomes the focus in policy SP7 on the sequencing of development and infrastructure provision to ensure that the latter is provided ahead of or in tandem with the development it supports.</p>	

7108		Mark Tonge										The draft plan describes having retail within the garden cities in order to curb traffic in the area. Any retail development needs to be focused on essential services for 2 reasons 1) shopping behaviour is changing, more and more people are shopping online. The draft plan misses the opportunity to introduce new housing solutions, such as could be delivered by pension funds which would be interested to invest and match their rental charges to their long-term pension liabilities.	None
7119		G120, Cirrus and L&Q (Iceni Projects, David Churchill)							h	yes		We support the production of a new Local Plan in principle and have worked closely with the Councils to date in the delivery of the Local Plan. In particular we support the Section 1 Plan, with particular regard to policies SP7 & SP9. We feel there are a number of areas the Councils need to strengthen their evidence base to ensure a sound and legally compliant Local Plan is demonstrated. We are happy to continue working with the Councils in delivering this.	Whilst we feel the principle of the Local Plan to date has been sound and legally compliant, there are a number of areas detailed within the representations where further evidence is required. We will continue to work with the Councils to ensure this evidence is delivered.
7142		Shirley Gard										Colchester infrastructure is already struggling to cope with the above influx especially the areas around the Hospital, Cants and Tollgate. Road congestion is becoming the norm, our precious Hospital is suffering because extra patients, Building an extra 40,000 homes may please the government but they do not live here! Should BUILDERS be made to contribute to surgeries, schools and shops after they must be making a good profit margin. The council must be more solvent with all the council tax being collected	None
7144		Sport England (Maggie Taylor)								yes		Principles (iii), (viii), (x) and (xiv) are particularly supported as they align with the principles in Sport England's and Public Health England's Active Design guidance which seek to create environments in developments that encourage physical activity.	
7162		Gladman Development (Mathieu Evans)	yes	yes	no	<input type="checkbox"/>		✓		h	yes	There are concerns over the speed of the delivery of garden communities and as such there is a lack of housing supply in the early part of the plan period and a shortfall of supply across the entire plan which needs to be addressed with further allocations. A review by Strutt and Parker is appended to the representation.	None
7195		Mr Richard Ward	yes	yes	no	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	✓	✓	w	yes	The proposals for 3 garden communities are contrary to National and Local Planning Policies because; They are far too big in relation to existing communities; the impact of noise and air pollution will be excessive; there will be few jobs for the imported people and the communities will become commuter dormitories; over extraction of water and the increased likelihood of flooding and the effluent will despoil the rivers affected; there is a concerning loss of agricultural land; the financial viability of providing infrastructure is suspect; The whole concept of these garden communities should be reconsidered and scale dramatically reduced (2000-3000)	None
7210		Pat Marsden			no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			In my opinion the Colchester Local Plan is hugely overambitious and flawed. We do not require ambitious economic growth in Colchester because this is already being largely supplied by the University of Essex and the Knowledge Gateway. Much of the other so-called demand for economic growth appears to be coming from not from local requirements but from the fact that people can no longer afford to live and work in London and they are leaving in droves, see; <a href="http://www.cityam.com/269004/exodus-number-people-moving-out-london-has-risen-80-per">http://www.cityam.com/269004/exodus-number-people-moving-out-london-has-risen-80-per</a>	
7213		Stormont Cox			no	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	h		1. Insufficient Infrastructure - Colchester hospital at capacity. Where are all of the jobs that would be needed to either buy or rent the properties that are proposed within this local plan? 2. Transport Links to and from Colchester - concern raised about lack of capacity on rail and road (A12)- major investment needed in this infrastructure.	



7214		Jane Bedford			no	✓	✓	✓	✓			Our Objection to the proposed garden communities are because of :- Inadequate infrastructure - including pressure on water supplies, waste disposal, medical facilities and emergency services, roads and transport. Loss of Greenfield sites - particularly agricultural land Need to utilise existing Brownfield / non greenfield sites for smaller developments prioritising affordable housing.	
7281		Braiswick Residents Association			no	☐	☐	☐	☐			Garden Communities won't reduce pressure on Colchester but will look to Colchester for facilities, work and shopping with resulting traffic. Public transport aspirations unrealistic. Traffic will still be a problem even comprised of low emission vehicles. No guarantees that 30% affordable housing figure will be achieved	
7466		Leonie Alpin, Maldon District Council			no			✓				The employment allocations for the Garden Communities should be explicitly stated in policy SP7 alongside the housing allocations. Without sufficient employment land being allocated and developed, the Garden Communities will become commuter settlements, not functional, sustainable communities.	
7471		Leonie Alpin, Maldon District Council			no			✓				The RAMS must cover the relevant designated sites in adjoining districts as the recreation and leisure impacts will extend beyond the plans borders. The supporting text needs to be revised to acknowledge that recreational and leisure impacts will be cross-boundary, not solely designated on sites within the three council areas. The impact on the Marks Tey garden community on the Blackwater Estuary must be included in the scope of the strategy. MDC wish to be involved in the development of the RAMS.	
7481		Lightwood Strategic										Monks Wood should be identified as part of the shared spatial strategy for North Essex. Full representation form and documents attached to support this	
	24	Mr Howard Phillips	No	No	No	✓	☐	☐	☐	No		The proposed West of Braintree is adjacent to Uttlesford District. It is known that some land owners own land straddling the boundary of Braintree and Uttlesford and are keen to see the land developed. There is no recorded discussion between Braintree and Uttlesford in respect of any proposed enlargement of the development. The duty to co-operate is questioned.	
	38	Ms Sue Dobson Bridleways Development Officer Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		Policy SP7 " Development and Delivery of New Garden Communities in North Essex: point (x) states that the Policy will utilise a multi-functional green-grid to create significant networks of new green infrastructure including new country parks at each garden community! We suggest that for this Plan to be considered sound, access to such green infrastructure and country parks should be accessible for ALL users, including equestrians. This will ensure that the Plan can be fully inclusive and not discriminate against one user sector.	Amend the Policy to incorporate those changes above which relate to fully-inclusive access for all users, including equestrians.
	54	Sport England Sport England Planning Manager Eastern Region Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes	☐	☐	☐	☐	No		Principles (iii), (viii), (x) and (xiv) are particularly supported as they align with the principles in Sport Englands and Public Health Englands Active Design guidance which seek to create environments in developments that encourage physical activity.	
	58	Mrs Janine Beacher	Yes	No	No	☐	✓	☐	☐	No		Please see above comments - summary will not suffice	Alternative placement of the expansion area of the Bluebridge Industrial estate: - North of existing construction, towards the new waste site. - unused area already in the Bluebridge Industrial Estate footprint Unnecessary building of the Halstead bypass: - If a Bypass is needed then it should be taken before entering Wakes Colne, through to Sudbury. This would then alleviate traffic issues within Earls Colne and other villages for heavy traffic wanting to use the Sudbury route from the A12.

	88		Mrs M Fray	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		The negative affect on Greenbelt land, wildlife, rural communities, history cannot be reversed if this goes ahead. If houses have to be built it needs to be next to existing properties and on brownfields. DO NOT ruin our countryside. Our children and grandchildren and all future generations won't be able to enjoy the countryside which makes our country what it is.	Look at brownfield land. Look at who is profiting from this proposal.
--	----	--	------------	----	----	----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	----	--	--	---

112	Mr Paul Gibbs Bellway Homes Ltd Agent: Mr Olivier Spencer Associate Andrew Martin Planning	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Bellway Homes objects to the identification of a broad location to accommodate a new Garden Community at West of Braintree. This objection is made on the grounds that: (I) the location of the new West of Braintree Garden Community is not as sustainable as the District's main towns; (II) with long lead in times, the new West of Braintree Garden Community is unlikely to deliver the projected number of dwellings during the plan period; and (III) the identification of broad locations for growth, to be subject to subsequent site-specific Development Plan Documents (DPDs), is contrary to the NPPF and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.	Bellway Homes preference is for the West of Braintree Garden Community to be removed from the Braintree Local Plan in its entirety and to be replaced with more sustainable housing sites on fringes of the Districts main towns. However, if this change is not supported by BDC or the Inspector appointed to consider the Plan, then a more pragmatic solution would be to: (a) identify additional housing sites around the fringes of the main towns, to ensure that the most sustainable sites in the District are allocated for growth and to boost housing supply in the early years of the plan period; (b) make formal site allocations for the new Garden Communities, to provide additional certainty regarding their deliverability and to comply with the requirements in the NPPF; and (c) reduce the housing numbers sought at the West of Braintree growth location, during the plan period, from 2,500 to 1,750, to reflect the long lead-in times prior to development. This would strengthen the Braintree Local Plan and enable the Plan to demonstrate better compliance with the soundness tests at paragraph 182 of the NPPF, without abandoning the overall North Essex Spatial Strategy and the work undertaken to date by BDC, Colchester Borough Council (CBC) and Tendring District Council (TDC).
130	Mr Kevin Diggins	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered		Section 1 – garden communities. I am extremely concerned to see the purple 'splodge' for the proposed garden communities comes right up to Feering village. Your plan currently proposes that Feering becomes a strategic growth location which in itself means that you are intending for there to be up to 1000 homes (750 in this local plan period) added to a village that only currently contains less than 850 houses with all the issues that will arise if that is taken forward. The purple splodge shows a 'garden village' coming right up to our border – this will result in Feering just becoming part of a new town (you may wish to call them garden villages but their intended size makes them towns!). If you are not intending the garden villages to creep into existing villages in this way then this should be made clear on the map – considerably more clarity is needed.	
157	Mrs S Osborne	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No		See above. see previous submissions earlier	West Tey should be rejected .advice of lord Kerslake should be followed. A area of Green belt land should be designated with immediate effect around Colchester to prevent urban sprawl/overdevelopment along A12 and reduce congestion,
168	Bovis Homes Ltd Agent: Mr Leslie Short Director Artisan Planning & Property ServicesS	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		We do not believe that the evidence exists for the virtual exclusion of Coggeshall from growth at a scale commensurate with that projected for the Braintree District or with its sustainability status as a Key Service Village. There is an over-reliance of housing delivery in new garden village settlements which are susceptible to delay either for technical reasons and/or local opposition.the overall strategy is inflexible and therefore unable to respond to an unexpected change in circumstances and events. The Local Plan does not allocate enough sites to meet the FOAN of the District by means of a sound strategy which reflects the needs of its varying communities. Restricting development in higher order settlements such as Coggeshall in the Local Plan is both contrary to the presumptions of NPPF para.14 and this is an unnecessarily high risk strategy.	

186		Bellway Homes Limited - Strategic Growth Agent: Mr Andrew Martin Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Support is extended to the principle of new Garden Communities in order to meet objectively assessed housing need in the North Essex local authority areas. Support is extended on the basis that the spatial strategy for growth in Part 2 of the Plan for Braintree, directs growth in the first instance to the key towns of Braintree and Witham followed by land surrounding the urban areas. Garden Communities will be required in the next tier of growth to cater for housing need in the plan period and beyond. However, specific objection is raised to the proposed West of Braintree Garden Community. This standalone proposal is not considered to be as sustainable as the Districts main towns (Braintree and Witham) and given the long lead in times expected, it is unlikely to deliver the projected number of dwellings that are proposed in the plan period. A more detailed critique of the proposed West of Braintree Garden Community is given in response to Policy SP10.	Removal of the proposed West of Braintree Garden Community, and its replacement with more sustainable housing sites adjoining the Districts main towns and in locations that are in closer proximity to a railway station, employment and other facilities.
190		Henry Price	No	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		GCs will not have critical mass and so the policy is unsound.	The inability of these garden communities to sustain 'a range of community services and facilities including health, education, retail, culture ....' because of their lack of critical mass renders the whole garden community policy fatally flawed. It should be replaced by policies to grow to critical mass and re-invigorate the miserable and failing hollowed-out towns of Braintree and Witham.
192		Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		8.14 and 8.15 in the above section BDC have failed to have proper cross boundary collaboration with UDC failing NPPF paragraph 155 BDC quote 7500 to 10000 homes eventually but that does not include the UDC quota which in all probability will be another 10000! This is not a game of poker. The councils do not credit the public with any form of intelligence. The councils arrogance throughout this whole process is contemptible. The lack of co-operation to comply with Paragraph 155 of the NPPF and actually have proper debate with the communities that these proposals will effect, is seemingly suggesting the decisions have been made and this is just a paper ticking exercise.	
201		Mr & Mrs Andrew Martin Agent: Mr Andrew Martin Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Support is extended to the principle of new Garden Communities in order to meet objectively assessed housing need in the North Essex local authority areas. Support is extended on the basis that the spatial strategy for growth in Part 2 of the Plan for Braintree, directs growth in the first instance to the key towns of Braintree and Witham followed by land surrounding the urban areas. Garden Communities will be required in the next tier of growth to cater for housing need in the plan period and beyond. However, specific objection is raised to the proposed West of Braintree Garden Community. This standalone proposal is not considered to be as sustainable as the Districts main towns (Braintree and Witham) and given the long lead in times expected, it is unlikely to deliver the projected number of dwellings that are proposed in the plan period. A more detailed critique of the proposed West of Braintree Garden Community is given in response to Policy SP10.	Removal of the proposed West of Braintree Garden Community, and its replacement with more sustainable housing sites adjoining the Districts main towns and in locations that are in closer proximity to a railway station, employment and other facilities.
214		Mr Peter Williams Director Williams Group Agent: Mrs Teresa Cook Principal Consultant Emery Planning Partnership Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		O/S Longer term proposals can't be given priority over proposals to expand Braintree. housing provision at the new garden communities should be reduced to reflect lead in times.	The planned delivery of housing within the plan period at the garden community locations in Braintree should be reduced by 1,300 to reflect evidence on lead-in times and the time taken to determine large scale applications.
231		Mr Stuart McAdam	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		In terms of SP7, Persimmon Homes supports the creation of three new garden communities. Given the emerging Local Plan is specific to Braintree District and the reliance upon two new garden community to deliver a sizable element of the housing and employment growth within the plan period (deliver 2,500 dwellings during the Braintree Local Plan to 2033) it is considered that the consultation draft lacks sufficient detail regarding (i) the preferred options for the Garden Communities. Cross boundary new settlements will require significant degrees of co-operation and joint delivery arrangements. Whilst acknowledging the work done to date, there remains a significant risk that the scale and complexity of the planning and the delivery of the Garden Communities will delay their anticipated delivery. It will be important that the Council appropriately resources and facilitates the timely delivery of the Development Plan Document for the Garden Community.	

246	Environment Agency Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	The supporting text in chapter 8 should provide further elaboration or perhaps more ambitious wording in relation to water efficiency. It would be useful to explain, briefly, what water neutral actually means. Although we do not consider that the issue is significant enough to tip it into a soundness matter, we do consider that the Local Plan should show greater ambition.	The Local Plan does not arguably follow a strategy that is justified. To a large extent, given the Garden Communities are located in a water stressed area, we consider that the most appropriate strategy is for the optional Building Regulation water efficiency to be sought in new residential developments. Although we do not consider that the issue is significant enough to tip it into a soundness matter, we do consider that the Local Plan should show greater ambition.
250	Mr and Mrs Andrew and Heather Farquharson	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	I support the concept and proposed locations for the creation of the garden communities as the most efficient way of providing much needed housing together with all the necessary infrastructure required to support those developments.	
286	Braintree South Alliance Agent: Mrs Gabrielle Rowan Associate Pegasus Planning Group	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	Policy SP 7 sets out a number of design, development and phased delivery principles for the development and delivery of three new garden communities. Braintrees reliance on two strategic Garden Settlements to meet its OAHN-based housing requirement, one of which is cross-boundary, makes the plan effective in the short term. Delivering comprehensively planned new communities underpinned by a package of infrastructure is inherently complex. A positively prepared and effective plan will build in short term contingency for the distinct possibility of strategic sites experiencing delays. This means allocating residential sites, such as Great Notley East and allowing these to come forward at the earliest opportunity ensuring that the Council will be able to meet its housing target and maintain a rolling five-year housing land supply and avoiding the risk of the plan quickly becoming out of date.	See summary
346	Mrs Nicola Joshua	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	The proposals for the total number of houses at the development of West Tey have increased considerably from the previous Draft Local Plan of June 2016 and deviate from the recommendations of Lord Kerslake of January 2017, and yet the evidence provided to justify the increase has not been adequately demonstrated.	
356	Choice Construction Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
357	Barkley Projects Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
358	Mr Watson-Steele Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
359	Mr Gavin Day DSG Developments Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.

360	Mr D P Nott Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
361	Granville Developments Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
362	Mr Lightly Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
363	Mrs D Golding Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
364	Mr W Kerry Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
365	Pertwee Estates Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
366	Mr G Williamson Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
367	Mrs J Scarlett Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
368	Mrs J Sawyer Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
370	Mr R Carter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.

371		Mr R Carter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
372		Ms Debbie Morgan Clerk Coggeshall Parish Council	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	466687 7	The plan should include the location and size of green buffers to prevent co-alescence of proposed new settlements and existing towns/villages	Mark areas of "green space" between potential new settlements and existing towns/villages
373		Mr M Harrington Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
374		Mr Martin Cowan Poplar Nurseries Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
375		Mr M Spurgeon Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
376		Mr D Clough Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
377		Mr & Mrs Harrison Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
379		The Shepherd Trust Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
381		Mr C Reid Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.

382		Mr D White Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
383		Mssrs Parmenter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
385		Mr C Hart Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
386		Mr M Allard Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The prohibitive infrastructure costs and uncertainty surrounding future highway investment make the proposed Garden Communities premature. Their environmental and blighting impacts are unacceptable and unjustified whilst there are alternative and preferable Spatial Strategies.	Defer long term strategic growth within Garden Communities for a separate DPD, delete referenced to the specified Garden Communities, and re-allocate their pre-2033 housing capacity via a revised Spatial Strategy.
414		Mr Peter Kohn Chariman Coggeshall Neighbourhood Plan Committee	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No		The plan should include the location and size of green buffers to prevent co-alescence of proposed new settlements and existing towns/villages	Mark areas of "green space" between potential new settlements and existing towns/villages



417	Choice Construction Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ✓	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting “ and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be “frozen out” of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	---------------------------------------	-----	--	--

419	Barkley Projects Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	---	-----	--	--

421	Mr Watson-Steele Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ✓	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting “ and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be “frozen out” of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	---------------------------------------	-----	--	--

423	Mr Gavin Day DSG Developments Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ✓	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting “ and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be “frozen out” of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	---------------------------------------	-----	--	--

427	Mr D P Nott Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	---	-----	--	--

429	<p>Granville Developments Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins &amp; Associates</p>	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<p>The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.</p>	<p>Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting “ and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be “frozen out” of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.</p>
-----	---	-----	----	----	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----	---	---

431	Mr Lightly Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ✓	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting “ and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be “frozen out” of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	---------------------------------------	-----	--	--

433	Mrs D Golding Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ✓	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	---------------------------------------	-----	--	--



435	Mr W Kerry Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting “ and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be “frozen out” of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	---	-----	--	--

437	Pertwee Estates Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ✓	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting “ and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be “frozen out” of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	---------------------------------------	-----	--	--

439	Mr G Williamson Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	---	-----	--	--

441	Mrs J Scarlett Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----	--	--

442	Mrs J Sawyer Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ✓	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting “ and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be “frozen out” of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	---------------------------------------	-----	--	--

445	Mr R Carter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ✓	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting “ and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be “frozen out” of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	---------------------------------------	-----	--	--

447	Mr R Carter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting “ and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be “frozen out” of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	---	-----	--	--

449	Mr M Harrington Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	---	-----	--	--



451	Mr Martin Cowan Poplar Nurseries Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting “ and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be “frozen out” of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----	--	--

452	Mr M Spurgeon Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	---	-----	--	--

455	Mr D Clough Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ✓	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting “ and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be “frozen out” of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	---------------------------------------	-----	--	--

457	Mr & Mrs Harrison Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	---	-----	--	--

459	The Shepherd Trust Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	---	-----	--	--

461	Mr C Reid Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	✓	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting “ and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be frozen out of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	-------------------------------------	---	-----	--	--

464	Mr D White Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	---	-----	----	----	---	-----	--	--

469	Mrs D Morrall Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting " and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be "frozen out" of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	---	-----	--	--



471	Mr C Hart Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ✓	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting “ and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be “frozen out” of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	---------------------------------------	-----	--	--

473	Mr M Allard Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ✓	Yes	The proposals to introduce Garden Communities are insufficiently justified and the ability to deliver the amount of development envisaged within the Plan period and beyond is uncertain and speculative. The Plans are overambitious in terms of the envisaged delivery of housing and jobs and it has not been demonstrated they constitute a more sustainable settlement pattern than alternative strategies.	Suggested Measures to make the Plan Sound 1. Provide a Vision Statement recognising the unsustainable nature of existing settlements with their heavy reliance on the motorcar and commuting “ and devise a strategy which is dedicated to making each District and settlement more self-contained and sustainable. 2. Delete the specified Garden Community proposals/allocations and make alternative provision in the form of other allocations, including smaller Garden Communities not exceeding 4,000 dwellings which are capable of being developed within or largely within the Plan period. 3. Defer decisions on long term (post 2033) strategic growth to a new DPP. 4. Focus growth within the urban areas, smaller Garden Communities, and Key Service Villages, whilst maintaining spacious gaps between settlements to avoid coalescence or near coalescence. 5. Make an appropriate increased level of housing and employment land provision within the other villages to improve their vitality and viability. 6. Tailor local housing provision to take account of and address the known requirements for affordable housing in the respective housing registers or other forecast need as the dearth of sites of under 10 dwellings is not helpful in this respect. 7. Place greater emphasis on the delivery of mixed-use schemes for smaller as well as larger allocations in order to provide a close physical relationship between housing and jobs. 8. Provide strategic freestanding employment sites where these can be well-connected to public transport and main road in order to reflect a need for larger scale employment centres to help reduce the need for long-distance commuting. 9. Refine the housing allocations to reflect the Governments suggestion that 10% of new allocations should be on sites of below 0.5ha. This should be in addition to the windfall site provision and would safeguard land and development opportunities for smaller to medium scale builders across the Districts who will otherwise be “frozen out” of the larger scale Garden Communities and strategic sites.
-----	--	-----	----	----	---------------------------------------	-----	--	--

504		Andrewsfield New Settlement Consortium Agent: Mr David Maxwell GL Hearn	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		OFFICER RESPONSE: ANSC also agrees with the general terms of the principles (i) to (xiii) set out within policy SP7. The enclosed Development Vision prepared by GL Hearn and master plan has been prepared with close regard to and adherence with the principles of garden city developments. ANSC will work closely and collaboratively with Braintree and Uttlesford District Councils, and with Galliard Homes relating to the Boxted Wood land towards a Development Plan Document (DPD) for the WBGC. The DPD will confirm the final principles of the design, development and phasing of the WBGC.	
508		Andrewsfield New Settlement Consortium Agent: Mr David Maxwell GL Hearn	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		Andrewsfield New Settlement Consortium (ANSC) supports the proposed Map 10.1 Garden Communities, specifically the inclusion of a new garden community towards the west of Braintree, north of the A120 and close to the district boundary with Uttlesford District. Nevertheless, ANSC recommends that Map 10.1 should be amended to identify the proposed WBGC up to and beyond the district boundary with Uttlesford, particularly now that UDC has confirmed within the Reg. 18 Uttlesford Local Plan the WBGC being provided within Uttlesford district.	
515		Essex Farms Agent: Mr Steven Bainbridge Associate Evolution Town Planning LLP	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	4687029	These representations support the proposal for a new Garden Settlement to the west of Braintree - the West of Braintree Garden Community. The representations also propose the inclusion of an additional area of land within the West of Braintree Garden Community 'search area' in order to ensure the plan is effective, justified and consistent with national policy, and to make the Plan 'sound'.	In order to make the Plan sound, a change to the Policies Map is required, extending the area of land identified for the West of Braintree Garden Community in line with the plan submitted and contained within Appendix 1 of the attached submission.
528		Consultation Service Natural England	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		OFFICER RESPONSE: Green infrastructure should be delivered according to a set of defined standards and Local Plan policies should seek to achieve net-gain and deliver some of the priorities in the Essex BAP, consistent with the NPPF paragraph 109. This could be achieved through enhancement and incorporation of biodiversity into the masterplan and detailed design of the Garden Communities, whilst avoiding any adverse impacts to nearby designates sites. Also see: other Advice below on the Strategic Growth DPD, and advice on paragraph 8.5 regarding policy commitment to a RAMS	
553		McDonnell Mohan Ltd McDonnell Mohan Ltd Agent: Mr Mark Jackson	Yes	Yes	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The site being promoted for Allocation is 4.6ha for employment development on the border of Braintree and Uttlesford District. The submissions made to the Council in March 2015 stated: "The proposal is for the allocation of the site for commercial warehouse and distribution use falling within Use Class B8. The site is well screened. Its value as Agricultural land has been diminished by the routing of the A120(T) and the formation of the B1417. The site is extremely accessible for the Strategic A120 (T) linking to the M11 and Stansted Airport and the A12 trunk road." The submission also included a Master Plan taking account of the on-site constraints. The site area is now, partly shown within the West of Braintree Garden Community, policies SP 7 and SP 10 of the Publication Draft refers.	That the site is included in the Draft Policies SP 7, SP 10 and the is shown within Map 10.2 A Land West of Braintree or its substitute. There is no logical reason that this land between the old A120 and new A120 should remain as agricultural land, undeveloped, for the reasons set out above.
566		Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	Sixth para add after the word requirements:as regards design, development and phased delivery Delete 7th para. Sub para ii " remove the long last sentence beginning with Given and put it above in the introduction. Sub para iii " add in front of word climate the words and on
571		Mr Des Dunlop	No	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No		It has been noted that details provided for the planned garden communities are vague with further details to be brought forward in subsequent DPDs. While D2 Planning do not object to the inclusion of the garden communities it is important that the wider spatial strategy provides flexibility to ensure that housing growth can be encouraged in all sustainable locations early in the plan period.	Amend Plan as per our representations.

578	Mr Kevin Money Clerk Feering Parish Council	Question not answered	No	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	WHY has the size of the Braintree / Colchester borders community been increased compared to the June 2016 proposal / January 2017 Lord Kerslake peer review? Why is this garden community so much larger than the other two proposed North Essex Garden Communities? Is it sound to plan to encompass such a large possible spread in homes in the Braintree / Colchester borders garden community proposal - especially when looking 15-30 years in the future. OBJECT to a Braintree / Colchester borders garden community with such a large number of proposed homes (15,000 - 24,000 homes) coupled with the large spread (9,000 homes).	The Braintree / Colchester borders garden community: ¢ reverts back to the more manageable & so deliverable originally proposed lower point figure of 15,000 new homes. ¢ that development does not start until - the route and scheme details of the A12 widening / improvement to expressway standard are signed-off, completed and operational around J25 at Marks Tey (both the J19-25 and the J25-29 schemes). - the A120 widening / improvement to expressway standard are signed-off, completed and operational around J25 at Marks Tey - capacity improvements are in place and operational on the London-Colchester railway line
579	Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	
585	Mr Mark Norman Highways England	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered	Whilst we recognise these are long term proposals they are dependent upon improvements to the A12 and A120 coming forward and the comments about the need for jobs, housing services, facilities and infrastructure coming ahead as the need develops is critical if a sustainable development is to be delivered. These sites are of a size to be able to internalise their own trips careful planning and delivery will be required to make sure that services, jobs and infrastructure come forward at the same time as demand is increased by new homes. If not there is a danger that trips will not be captured on site and the impact of the development on the surrounding network could be unsustainable. There is a 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 that the evidence base is robust.	
598	Mrs Carol Richards Diocese of Chelmsford	Question not answered	Question not answered	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Question not answered	O/S - For Policy SP7 to be sound "places of worship" needs to be included in the list of community services and facilities. Since the NPPF specifically mentions "places of worship" this policy SP7 should also specifically mention "places of worship" as it cannot be assumed that "places of worship" are included if they are not mentioned.	For Policy SP7 to be sound ¢places of worship• needs to be included in the list of community services and facilities. Since the NPPF specifically mentions ¢places of worship• this policy SP7 should also specifically mention ¢places of worship• as it cannot be assumed that ¢places of worship• are included if they are not mentioned.
604	Cllr Andrew Hensman Cllr Braintree Central & Beckers Green Ward	Yes	Yes	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	Garden Communities are a great way of a large, purpose-built development, properly planned so as to provide everything sensibly. To serve these better is to add provision for public transport. Returning the railway from Braintree Westwards, it could be connected to Stansted airport via Rayne, the new settlement near Sailing, North of Dunmow into the airport with a parkway station built to serve those commuters from the wider district currently using cars to get to Chelmsford or Witham. This would increase the service to half-hourly, and give resilience for when the mainline is closed between Stratford and Witham. It will also make the District a more attractive place to live and work. My main reasons is with the government's desire to ban combustion engine vehicles by 2040 this district needs to use this plan to prepare for this with it happening within 7 years of its end.	
606	Cllr James Abbott Silver End & Cressing Ward	No	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	Delete West of Braintree from the plan or reduce the allocation to that required in the plan period (2,500).	Delete West of Braintree from the plan or reduce it to the required allocation for this site in the plan period of 2,500 houses.
608	Cllr James Abbott Silver End & Cressing Ward	No	No	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	Delete West Tey from the plan or reduce the allocation to that required in the plan period (7,500)	Delete West Tey from the plan or reduce it to the required allocation for that site in the plan period of 2,500 homes.

611		Cllr James Abbott Silver End & Cressing Ward	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	□	Yes		Include a map showing the whole of the area proposed Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community at the same scale as in Map 10.2B (ie all of that in Braintree District & Colchester Borough).	To make the plan sound and compliant there needs to be a map included showing the full extent of the proposed Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community.
622		Mr Don Smith Chairman - Rayne Parish Council Rayne Parish Council	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	□	□	□	□	Question not answered		O/S Various comments made about the infrastructure development plan, the Essex Garden Community Charter, and the Draft Local Plan Section one. Issues regarding a lack of detail and information for the proposals, needs a full assessment of the impact of these proposed communities.	
629		Mr Douglas McNab Forward Planning Manager - South East Education and Skills Funding Agency Department For Education	Yes	Yes	Yes	□	□	□	□	No		The ESFA also welcomes the focus in policy SP7 on the sequencing of development and infrastructure provision to ensure that the latter is provided ahead of or in tandem with the development it supports. Policies SP 8, 9 and 10 relate to each of the three proposed Garden Communities. Each policy requires at least one secondary school, primary schools (number and size unspecified) and early-years facilities to be provided to serve new development. The Integrated Delivery Plans for each district provide further details of the number and size of primary and secondary schools required. These details should be included in the above mentioned policies to further demonstrate that the plan has been positively prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed infrastructure requirements.	
638		Miss Charlotte Self Planner/Assistant Project Manager Kodiak Land	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		Kodiak support the overall strategy of the plan however we do believe that its over-reliance on the delivery of large scale garden communities threatens the deliverability of the overall housing requirement. We would support a spatial strategy that distributes growth more evenly across the district's existing settlements, in addition to the new garden communities, in line with national policy. We also believe that reserve sites should be identified to provide a contingency if the housing requirement is not met.	As detailed in our wider representation
643		Dr Natalie Gates Principal Advisor, Historic Places Team Historic England	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	□	□	□	□	Question not answered		O/S - There has not been a demonstrable consideration of the impact of any such policy on the historic environment. It is essential that the local plan should contain a framework to guide how the boundaries and extent of the garden communities are determined in the subsequent development plan documents. Historic Impact Assessments should be undertaken in accordance with our advice note Site allocations in Local Plans for each of the proposed broad locations to determine the appropriateness or otherwise of the locations for development, the extent of the development and therefore potential capacity of the sites, the impacts upon the historic environment considering each asset and its setting and its significance, impacts of development upon the asset and any potential mitigation measures necessary to accompany the proposals. Appropriate criteria needs to be included in each of the policies and supporting text for the Garden Communities.	
645		Dr Natalie Gates Principal Advisor, Historic Places Team Historic England	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	□	□	□	□	Question not answered		O/S - How will the extent of the garden communities be established. Need for a reference to Heritage Impact Assessment. Need for reference to safeguarding buffers around heritage assets.	
665		Mr & Mrs R Pertwee	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	□	□	□	□	Question not answered		The proposed Garden Centres Communities one of which is not on your maps because it falls in Littleford District: Eastern West of Dunmow makes the North of Essex one long urban city from M11 along A120 to the East Coast of Essex.  You would go from Little Easter (West of Braintree) Saling  West Tey (Marks Tey) (East of Braintree & West Colchester/ East of Colchester)  Tending  Perhaps one is naïve to think that not all will go ahead.  Chelmsford has also expanded to an enormous area and where is the infrastructure to cope with many thousands of people?  The only hope is that an overall plan for Essex and other Counties will be draw up, and common sense will prevail,	

		LPPD9	Mr Andrew Martin, Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	No		✓	✓	✓			Support is extended to the principle of new Garden Communities in order to meet objectively assessed housing need in the North Essex local authority areas. Support is extended on the basis that the spatial strategy for growth in Part 2 of the Plan for Tend	None.
		LPPD15	MR LESLIE SHORT, Artisan PPS Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓			[Officer summary] Whilst the Spatial Strategy states that existing settlements will be the principal focus for additional growth across North Essex, the plan does not follow that strategy because of the allocation of substantial areas for growth in the form of new settlements rather than directing development to existing sustainable settlements. Land at Foots Farm, Clacton should be reclassified as brownfield land and appropriately prioritised for development in accordance with the Framework.	[Officer interpretation] Allocate additional sites for housing around existing settlements, such as land at Centenary Way, Clacton (Foots Farm).
		LPPD18	Mr Douglas McNab, Forward Planning Manager - South East Education & Skills Funding Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes							8. The ESFA also welcomes the focus in policy SP7 on the sequencing of development and infrastructure provision to ensure that the latter is provided ahead of or in tandem with the development it supports. Policies SP 8, 9 and 10 relate to each of the three proposed Garden Communities. Each policy requires at least one secondary school, primary schools (number and size unspecified) and early-years facilities to be provided to serve new development. The Integrated Delivery Plans for each district provide further details of the number and size of primary and secondary schools required. These details should be included in the above mentioned policies to further demonstrate that the plan has been positively prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed infrastructure requirements. 9. 9. The ESFA notes that a site specific Strategic Growth DPD will be developed for the garden communities and that this will include further details of how infrastructure will be delivered and phased alongside new development, including allocating specific sites for schools.	None.
		LPPD24	Mr Andrew Hunter, Planning Advisor - Sustainable Places Team Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No	✓						The supporting text in chapter 8 should provide further elaboration or perhaps more ambitious wording in relation to water efficiency. It would be useful to explain, briefly, what water neutral actually means. Although we do not consider that the issue is significant enough to tip it into a soundness matter, we do consider that the Local Plan should show greater ambition.	The Local Plan does not arguably follow a strategy that is justified. To a large extent, given the Garden Communities are located in a water stressed area, we consider that the most appropriate strategy is for the optional Building Regulation water efficiency to be sought in new residential developments. Although we do not consider that the issue is significant enough to tip it into a soundness matter, we do consider that the Local Plan should show greater ambition.
		LPPD37	Historic Environment Planning Adviser, Historic England	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓					Officer summary - HE remain concerned that there has not been a demonstrable consideration of the impact of Garden Communities on the historic environment. Plan should contain a framework to guide how boundaries and extent of garden communities are determined. Historic Impact Assessments should be undertaken. Appropriate criteria for protection of heritage assets and settings needs to be included.	inclusion of an additional criterion in Policy SP7, to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment in accordance with our advice note 3 Site Allocations in Local Plans in order to assess impact of the proposed allocation upon the historic environment, to inform the appropriate extent of the development and establish any mitigation measures necessary. This might include appropriate safeguarding buffers around heritage assets such as historic parks and gardens, scheduled monuments, conservation areas and listed buildings and identify how the historic environment and heritage assets can form part of the development of successful schemes.
		LPPD42	Mr Geoff Armstrong, Armstrong Rigg	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓			[Officer summary] The level of housing supply predicted from the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community is over ambitious due to the time needed to complete the Development Plan Document and the subsequent lead-on time for development. We suggest that only 500 homes are deliverable, in Tendring, within the plan period – not 1,250.	[Officer interpretation] Allocate additional sites for housing to meet the objectively assessed need.
		LPPD61	Mr Matthew Utting, Director MatPlan Limited	Yes	Yes	No			✓				[Officer summary] Specific boundaries for the Garden Community have yet to be determined, let alone a Masterplan Framework devised, consulted upon and adopted to guide the proposal's delivery. The submission and approval of a planning application for the Garden Community must be some years away. The delivery rates required to achieve 1,250 dwellings for Tendring in the plan period are over-optimistic and there is insufficient evidence to support these assumptions – particularly as the garden community lies within a Minerals Safeguarding Area which could cause significant delay.	[Officer interpretation] Allocate additional sites for housing to meet the objectively assessed need.

		LPPD66	Mr David Moseley, Strategic Planner Persimmon Homes	Yes	Yes	Yes						Persimmon Homes supports the creation of three new garden communities. Cross boundary new settlements will require significant degrees of co-operation and joint delivery arrangements. Whilst acknowledging the work done to date, there remains a significant risk that the scale and complexity of the planning and the delivery of the Garden Communities will delay their anticipated delivery. It will be important that the Council appropriately resources and facilitates the timely delivery of the Development Plan Document for the Garden Community.	None.
		LPPD79	Jill Hughes, AM Planning	Yes	Yes	No		✓	✓			Support is extended to the principle of new Garden Communities in order to meet objectively assessed housing need in the North Essex local authority areas. Support is extended on the basis that the spatial strategy for growth in Part 2 of the Plan for Tendring, directs growth in accordance with a settlement hierarchy that prioritises locations with access to the strategic road network, public transport and which have the potential to offer the widest range of services. Garden Communities will be required in the next tier of growth to cater for housing need in the plan period and beyond. However, specific objection is raised to the proposed Garden Community that straddles the districts of Tendring and Colchester (the Colchester Borders Garden Community). Given the long lead in times expected, it is unlikely to deliver the projected number of dwellings that are proposed in the plan period.	Improve the flexibility of the plan by identifying additional sustainable housing sites in accordance with the spatial strategy for growth set out in Part 2 of the Plan for Tendring.
		LPPD89	Phil Bamford, Gladman	Yes	Yes	No			✓			Having regard to the need for the preparation of the DPDs, a significant amount of land assembly to be undertaken, the need for a considerable amount of infrastructure to be provided and the expectation that these developments will each involve two authorities, Gladman considers that it is extremely unlikely that the delivery of new housing on these sites will be achieved within the timescales anticipated by the Councils. Furthermore, the inclusion of a requirement for Gypsy and Traveller provision to be made on the sites is also likely to add further complications (and thus delay) to the development process. Attributing dwellings completions on a 50:50 ratio between the two districts concerned is artificial and is totally unjustified and unsupported by the NPPF and PPG.	[Officer interpretation] Allocate additional sites for housing to meet the objectively assessed need.
		LPPD10 1	Matthew Parsons, Persimmon Homes	Yes	Yes	Yes						Persimmon Homes supports the creation of three new garden communities. Cross boundary new settlements will require significant degrees of co-operation and joint delivery arrangements. Whilst acknowledging the work done to date, there remains a significant risk that the scale and complexity of the planning and the delivery of the Garden Communities will delay their anticipated delivery. It will be important that the Council appropriately resources and facilitates the timely delivery of the Development Plan Document for the Garden Community.	None.
		LPPD10 2	Matthew Parsons, Persimmon Homes	Yes	Yes	Yes						[Officer summary] Persimmon Homes object to the affordable housing target of 30%(set out in Policies SP8, 9 and 10) being a"minimum". The Local Plan must set out clearly the target it is seeking to achieve and, in line with Para 173 of the NPPF, assess the implications for development viability having regard to the scale of obligations and policy burdens of the development plan as a whole. It is considered that an uncapped target does not provide certainty and could place a policy burden that would threaten viability. The market and purchasing decisions factor in policy requirements and not having clarity would give rise to significant uncertainty that would not assist delivery.	[Officer interpretation] Do not require 30% affordable housing as a minimum in Policies SP8, 9 or 10.

**LPA Response:**

A number of the representations to this section raised similar points and these have been grouped into broad themes with the Council response set out below. In summary, no changes are considered necessary to Policy SP7.

**Phasing** - A number of representations questioned whether the garden communities would deliver the housing requirements set out within this policy and suggested that other sites be brought forward as well as the garden communities to ensure delivery. The policy proposes that on each garden community 2,500 homes will be delivered by the end of the Local Plan period. The trajectory shows that housing delivery are not expected to start on any of the sites until the second half of the Local Plan period. The Councils believe that this provides a realistic timescale to complete all the necessary planning and legal steps and build the first phases of infrastructure to allow for new homes to be built. The rate of house building on the sites once building has begun is considered relatively modest related to the overall scale of the development and is based on a number of private and affordable house builders on each of the sites at any one time. The delivery rates have been set through research of delivery rates achieved in other large scale developments, both locally and nationally, aided by the ATLAS team. More detail on the phasing and delivery rates will be set out in the DPD process, which has already begun. The Local Plan will also of course be subject to the usual annual monitoring and review processes in order to keep the timescales under review.

**Detail** - In common with policy SP6, a number of more detailed comments have been raised about particular features or requirements. The Local Plan section 1 is a strategic document, setting out overall principles for development. As such matters of detail will be set out in other policies. Most notably for each of the garden communities, a site specific DPD is currently being progressed and this will cover many of the detailed issues identified within these representations

**Infrastructure and Facilities** - The infrastructure requirements for new development are a very important concern for both the public and the local authorities. Policy SP7 discusses high level key principles for the garden communities and should also be read in the context of the other policies within section 1, most notably policy SP5 on infrastructure and connectivity. There are also a number of infrastructure and viability documents set out in the evidence base. The Council continues to work with statutory bodies like Anglian Water, the Environment Agency and the education authority to ensure that appropriate facilities are in place, and are confident that this can be achieved. Further detail on the phasing and amount of infrastructure required will be set out within the DPD's being produced for each garden community. Places of worship are included within community facilities and this is set out in the glossary

**Affordable Housing** - Some representors have raised the issue of affordable housing. The Council's evidence bases each set out work on affordable housing needs and viability assessments and these show that 30% affordable housing is deliverable across all the communities. Housing for all is a key part of the Garden City Principles and it is essential that the communities plan for the appropriate mix of homes. More detail on the exact mix of homes within that 30% bracket (affordable rent, sale etc) will be set out within the DPD's. It is however accepted that there is a slight error between this policy and the site specific policies with the term 'minimum' missing from this policy. The Councils would be happy for this to be made consistent by the Inspector across all the policies.

CBC rep ID	BDC rep ID	TDC rep ID	Name, Organisation		Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/ written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan
				Legally compliant										
<b>Cross Boundary Garden Communities</b>														
6106			Richard Waylen	yes	yes	yes					w		I believe the volume could be accommodated by changing the bulk of Colchester town centre from retail to housing	Leave two or three major development (Fenwicks, Primark Debenhams) convert remainder to housing. Allow retail to spread at Stanway, Northern Gateway and the Hythe. This would negate the need for significant changes to Infrastructure.
6262			Diocese of Chelmsford (Church of England)	yes	yes	no				✓	h		Section E Community Infrastructure is not compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework because it does not mention places of worship. Section 70 of the NPPF states: "To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should: plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments."	For Policy SP8 to be sound "places of worship" needs to be included in the list of community services and facilities. Since the NPPF specifically mentions "places of worship" this policy SP8 should also specifically mention "places of worship" as it cannot be assumed that "places of worship" are included if they are not mentioned. The most appropriate place to add this information is point 12 "Community meeting places will be provided within the local centres including places of worship".
6287			Marks Tey Church										I'm delighted that 8.14 repeats 8.11, especially the crucial "Each of the authorities is committed to ensuring ... that the infrastructure needed to support them is delivered at the right time."	None
6335			Anglia Water (Stewart Patience)										Anglian Water recognises the significance of the Essex Garden communities to the North Essex area and the level of ambition that the authorities have for these developments have to be as sustainable and high quality as possible and that infrastructure needed to deliver them is delivered at the right time.  We would welcome the opportunity to work with the authorities and developers both in relation to the provision of water and water recycling infrastructure and delivering an exemplary development including innovation relating to increased water efficiency/re-use.	



6353		Louisa Efstratiou	no	no	no	✓				W	<p>Any development East of Colchester in Tendring/Colchester Borders should be over the brow of the hill out-of-sight of residents of Greenstead and Longridge. Ideally a 1.5km green buffer between current housing and new development. This is supported by Greenstead Ward councillors.</p> <p>- The green area between current and new housing should be a 'Country Park', for the enjoyment of the occupants of the 9,000 new houses and the existing residents.</p> <p>- Any new roads should incorporate noise shielding to prevent traffic disturbance.</p> <p>- The Strategic Growth Development Plan should be subject to public consultation regarding new development and green space.</p>	Housing design in the new development should be comparable with the best in Colchester, photos of which have been sent to planners. Please contact Colchester East Action Group for more details.
	67	Mr John August Galliard Homes Ltd Agent: Mr Martin Herbert WYG	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	O/S - Ensure new community is delivered as efficiently and to as high a quality as possible. Support the use of DPD, flexible housing distribution with realistic building rates needed,	
	71	Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No				✓	No	Does not comply with NPPF 155	
	81	Mr Christopher Bailey Owner Agent: Mr Christopher Bailey Clockhouse Town Planning	Yes	No	No	✓	✓	✓		Yes	<p>This country has voted to leave the European Union and to no longer be at the control of the European Courts. In response HM Government has committed to return ultimate sovereignty to the Houses of Parliament. Reference to designations made by an outside body that constrain the ability of the British people to make their own choices is therefore contrary to national policy. The issues and Options paper failed to ask the community if it wanted to be constrained by external designations. Indeed the Issues and Options paper ignored the entire issue all together. The plan is therefore not positively prepared. It is not justified being reliant on external influence. From this point forward all of the following chapter is not sound not being justified nor effective or in conformity with National Policy.</p>	Reject the entire chapter and instruct the LPA to restart seeking locations for new settlement that maximise human benefit over the interests of those who are interested in the so called natural environment.
	93	Cllr. Mike Banthorpe Rayne Ward	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	<p>West of Braintree in Braintree DC, a new garden community will deliver 2,500 homes within the Plan period (as part of an overall total of between 7,000- 10,000 homes to be delivered beyond 2033) In respect of the maximum number of 10K homes there are two suggestions by the consultants which would in theory accommodate such a number. However these would be either very close to Gt.Saling/Bardfield Saling or Rayne. The residents of Rayne had not been given any indication that the development may eventually use the proposed Mineral site, as it was to be a nature reserve or restored farm land. Therefore, as Uttlesford have now indicated that they propose to build nearly 1K home over the District Boundary the suggest number of 6900 homes has to be the maximum number if this New Development is to be considered further. The effect that additional traffic would have on Rayne would be totally unacceptable and surrounding road networks.</p>	As the three options were not made public until very late by Aecom in May, I think the lesser number of homes should now be the only considered option as in Northern scheme (Reduced), especially as we now have an indication from Uttlesford they intend to develop across the boundary.
	97	Mr Robert Suckling	No	No	No				✓	No	<p>The construction of Garden Communities would be in direct conflict with the aims laid out in the National Planning Policy Framework and should be dropped. The construction of Garden Communities will have a MASSIVE impact on our environment. Planning departments have a clear responsibility to consider and publish alternatives rather than take the easy way out !</p>	
	99	Mr Graham Dalby	Yes	Yes	No		✓	✓		No	<p>We already have too many people in the area, and the infrastructure can't cope with more. Pollution is already bad and will get worse if we build more houses as the amount of traffic will increase.</p>	Drastically scale down planned house building.

	109	Mr Garry Adams	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No		The whole WoBGC idea is nonsense. It makes assumptions about transport, employment, infrastructure and services which are simply beyond BDC's ability to deliver. Both BDC and UDC assume that many £100m will be available from the magic money tree to fix all the multitudinous infrastructure problems that their ill thought out plans will bring forth. The SP10 discussion is just a wish list and does not detail the tests and thresholds any plan must pass before it is declared as viable.	Review all proposals (from BDC, UDC and ECC) which impact the A120, local water supply, hospitals, employment and other service provision and restrict the start of any new Garden Community development that is inconsistent with such provision. These facilities must be available in advance of major new town development; not as some 'wish list' after thought.
	137	Mr Ben Chandler	No	No	No	✓		✓	✓	Yes		On the West of Braintree development, there is no evidence that the council has undertaken any of its requirements under the Duty to Cooperate principle. Despite several parties asking, there has been no proof provided of any meetings, working party group activities or even conversations, between BDC and Uttlesford District Council.	The Local Plan has been put together using central government policy at it's core, and central government payments for delivering housing as the main driver for it's design, in order to plug a financial gap in BDC's short and medium term budgets. Representatives of the council have openly admitted this. It does not represent the requirements or desires of the majority of the district residents, whose views have been continuously ignored. Accordingly, the plan should be re-drafted, from the call-for-sites stage. Brownfield sites, such as the MOD site in Weathersfield that can accommodate 5,000 houses, have been ignored and eliminated for consideration without any explanation at all.
	162	Ms Jane Goodwin	No	No	No					No		I believe that this Local Plan is not sound and the duty to co-operate with UDC is not evidenced.	I consider that it is the duty of BDC to reconsider this plan , exploring more appropriate brown field sites.
	167	Mrs Jacqueline Kingdom	No	No	No		✓			Yes		All existing and successful new settlements are centred on a mainline railway route and a trunk road which connects at least two cities. West of Braintree proposal can only ever be a glorious housing estate. It is unsustainable	Scrap this plan.
	175	Mr Trevor Rippingale	No	No	No	✓	✓			No		The West of Braintree Garden Community proposal is simply in the wrong place, and is being forced through to hit housing targets for the council; therefore I do not feel it has been positively prepared or justified. All three proposals for the site are destructive to the local communities that would surround them.	Either the council needs to come up with different locations for the garden villages, or they should change policy and look to do something else to hit the housing targets.
	179	Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No					No		BDC have failed to comply with NPPF paragraph 155 with not engaging with neighbours and the communities involved with the proposed Garden Communities.	
	180	Mrs Nina Crabb Planning Advisor National Trust Agent: Mrs Nina Crabb	Yes	Yes	No				✓	Yes		The National Trust remains concerned with regard to the potential impacts in relation to Hatfield Forest (a SSSI, Nature Reserve and Ancient Woodland) which is already operating beyond capacity (as set out in the 'Every Step Counts - Concept Paper'. Any development which would increase visitor numbers would have a potentially serious impact on this property. Braintree District Council area lies geographically close to this asset and it is noted that a new garden community is proposed to be located to the western boundary of the District and as such is likely to have impacts on Hatfield Forest. Having regard to the comments made by the Trust in response to the previous Local Plan consultation, the Trust is disappointed that no reference has been made to Hatfield Forest. The proposed new garden community will be located less than 12 miles from Hatfield Forest.	To include reference to Hatfield Forest & to ensure that the new settlement to the west of Braintree considers the impact of new development upon the Forest which operating beyond capacity and considers mitigation strategies.
	224	Mrs Sandi Merifield	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No		I do not consider that this Draft Local Plan is sound as it does not meet N.P.P.F. Paras 29/30/34/35/36 as can be evidenced from the AECOM report	I have no suggestions to make ,and suggest that BDC rethink and reassess this plan

	226		Ms Margaret Rufus	No	Yes	No		✓	✓		No	Employment opportunities are poorly considered and will be inadequate in number and quality for the needs of the West of Braintree Community population. The Garden Community should not be located to the west of Braintree because the transportation needs will not be accommodated by the present road and rail infrastructure. Protection of and potential damage to ancient woodland and other natural assets is insufficient/ill-considered.	As above
	230		Mr Stuart McAdam	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Existing settlements will be the principal focus for additional growth across North Essex. Persimmon Homes is supportive of focusing growth within the main settlements as these represent the most sustainable locations to accommodate new development which can in turn support future employment and leisure growth in these locations. Furthermore, they benefit from established infrastructure which can assist the early delivery.	
	526		Consultation Service Natural England	Yes	Yes	No					Yes	OFFICER RESPONSE: A RAMS is a delivery mechanism to mitigate recreational impacts identified through the HRA process from Local Plans as a whole, and not only those arising from the Garden Communities elements of the Plans. Therefore a policy commitment to a RAMS should be made. This should be under Policy SP 6 and would be in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 114 and 118. Without the policy commitment to a RAMS, it is our view that the Plan would fail legal and procedural compliance. This is because identified impacts have no mechanism for mitigation and the Plan would not comply with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations.	
	644		Dr Natalie Gates Principal Advisor, Historic Places Team Historic England	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Question not answered	O/S - Repetition in paragraphs, reference need for impact on heritage assets.	
		LPPD36	Historic Environment Planning Adviser, Historic England	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓			Paras 8.2 to 8.6 " These paragraphs do not refer to the potential for detrimental impacts on heritage assets despite the statement in para 5.8 of the Sustainability Appraisal Main Report (page 49) that identifies that the garden communities option could this option could "lead to negative effects on the settings of these assets, or the assets themselves, resulting in negative effects on SA Objective 10: "Historic environment." Given the presence of heritage assets within or in the vicinity of the identified areas for garden communities it is considered that reference should be made in these paragraphs of the Plan to the need to have appropriate regard to the existence of heritage assets in the areas and the need for proposals to have no unacceptable impact on them. It is considered that the location and design of garden communities should be informed in the first place by the potential to assimilate the proposals into the landscape without unacceptable detrimental impacts on designated historic and natural assets. See our comments regarding HIA for Garden Communities above.	Councils agree to undertake a HIA for each of the garden communities and will work with Heritage England to provide appropriate references in these supporting paragraphs
		LPPD51	Howard Green, UK Power Networks	Yes	Yes	Yes						Firstly our assessment is based on existing typical levels of consumption per new household. I have attached a plan showing the existing UKPN major substations in Tendring District, Grid substations (132/33kV) and Primary substations (33/11kV). The drawing is annotated with substation capacities and demands from the 2016/17 winter. Initially addressing the proposed Garden Community on the border with Colchester: The existing infrastructure in the area is adequate to meet the initial requirement of 2500 new homes from the 33/11kV substations at Parsons Heath and Colchester Hythe Quay. There will be a need to extend the 11kV network to meet the require levels of supply. It is possible that in order to meet a further 4500 " 6500 additional homes, a new 33/11kV substation may be required in the area. This would require new 33kV circuits from the 132/33kV substation near Ardleigh (known as Lawford Grid) to a suitable site on or near the proposed development.	

**LPA Response:** Representations to this sections largely consisted of general criticisms of the Garden Communities concept and location which are considered to be covered by Council responses to other policies concerning the spatial strategy and Garden Communities. On the comment from Historic England, the councils agree to undertake a HIA for each of the garden communities and will work with Heritage England to provide appropriate references in these supporting paragraphs.

CBC rep ID	BDC rep ID	TDC rep ID	Name, Organisation	Legally compliant	Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/ written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan
<b>Policy SP8</b>														
6108			Richard Waylen	yes	yes	yes					w		Guarantees of infrastructure to be provided before housing is built	Guarantees from other agencies that the infrastructure will be improve to first meet existing demands, then be further enhanced to cope with future requirements Hospital / health care and road / rail
6156			The University of Essex (The JTS Partnership)										The University of Essex welcomes the collaborative approach being taken by Colchester, Tendring and Braintree Councils towards the delivery of major infrastructure, housing and employment allocations across the North Essex area.	None
6164			The University of Essex (The JTS Partnership)										The University of Essex notes, and welcomes, the policy and supports the need to integrate the new Garden Community with its own activities and development proposals for the Campus and the Knowledge Gateway. The University is, however, disappointed that there is no explicit acknowledgement of the need to provide a good quality, preferably dual carriageway, link, from the A120 to the A133, as an early part of the development.	None
6212			North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group									yes	SP8: Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community, point E item 13. should be amended to read 'Primary healthcare facilities as appropriate'. .	SP8: Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community, point E item 13. should be amended to read 'Primary healthcare facilities as appropriate'.
6267			Peter Marchant, Colchester East Action Group	yes	yes	no				✓	w		All new development should be over the brow of the hill and out-of-sight of existing residents. Housing design should be excellent. References to historical Colchester.	Please include the above ideas as requirements in the local plan.
6268			Peter Marchant, Colchester East Action Group	yes	yes	no				✓	w		Any new road in the area should incorporate noise shielding to prevent disturbance to residents from traffic noise	Any new road in the area should incorporate noise shielding to prevent disturbance to residents from traffic noise.

6280		Wivenhoe Town Council	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓		A		<p>The policy of 'rapid transit' as a prime means of reducing the impact of the East garden settlement is unsound, as it is already clear that nothing resembling rapid transit is achievable either physically / affordably.</p> <p>The policy of P&amp;R in the east is unsound because it is based on a wholly reality-phobic view of what P&amp;R can achieve in Colchester generally.</p>	<p>The term rapid transport needs to be removed - as evidenced in this submission there is no scope for this to be anything other than a limited park and ride. Logically therefore the development needs to reduce to the capacity that can be provided by traditional transport streams. The Knowledge gateway employs circa 120 people and will never provide the scale or kind of jobs a development of this scale will require. We urge you to read our submission again and take note of the implications of the current transport considerations .</p>
6301		Anglian Water Services Limited (Stewart Patience)	yes	yes	no			✓		h		<p>Reference is made to an upgrade to Colchester waste water treatment plant and off-site improvements to the foul sewerage network which is welcomed.</p> <p>It would be helpful to 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.</p>	<p>It is therefore proposed that Policy SP8 is amended as follows:</p> <p>'Provision of improvements to waste water treatment including an upgrade to the Colchester Waste Water Treatment Plant and off-site drainage improvements to be aligned with the phasing of the development within the plan period and that proposed post 2033.'</p>
6308		Clive Salmon	yes	yes	yes					w		<p>Any new development to the East of Colchester in the Tendring/Colchester Borders should be over the brow of the hill and out-of-sight of existing residents of Greenstead and Longridge Park. Ideally, there should be a 2km green, undeveloped buffer between current housing and any new development. This idea is supported by the Greenstead Ward councillors.</p>	<p>Any new development to the East of Colchester in the Tendring/Colchester Borders should be over the brow of the hill and out-of-sight of existing residents of Greenstead and Longridge Park. Ideally, there should be a 2km green, undeveloped buffer between current housing and any new development. This idea is supported by the Greenstead Ward councillors.</p>
6346		Wivenhoe Society	yes	no	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	A	yes	<p>The proposal is unsound because: (i) it uses agricultural land rated excellent; (ii) It has potential to impact on European designated sites; (iii) it is effectively an extension to Colchester so any affordable housing will not be well located for Tendring residents nor will it help foster economic growth in Tendring; (iv) no feasible solutions for a rapid transit system or possible congestion mitigation measures have been put forward.</p>	<p>If a garden settlement to the east of Colchester can be demonstrated to be necessary then potential alternative sites further to the east should be explored to reduce the impact on Colchester, to give a greater boost to the Tendring economy and to use lower grade agricultural land</p>
6354		Chris Hill	yes	no	no	✓	✓			w		<p>No provision for the location and size of Salary Brook Country Park. Therefore insufficient protection of endangered species and distinctive sense of place in the area. Insufficient provision for new infrastructure to be implemented before development commences, risking increasing existing pressure on already overstretched local facilities. Does not mention existing flooding issues in the area, or include specific mitigations to prevent exacerbating the problem in the existing Flood Zone 3 area. According to the council's own study 'surface water networks are at capacity... surface water cannot be discharged to the existing disposal network'.</p>	<p>As in the Preferred Options draft, the Plan should specify that the Country Park will be a minimum of 150 hectares. It should also create a green buffer at least 1.5km from current housing. Stronger protections to ensure that infrastructure is delivered before development commences. Specific mention of flood risk at Salary Brook and specific mitigations proposed to ensure the new development does not increase existing flood risk even further.</p>
6356		Cllr Julie Young										<p>To enable the existing communities and the new garden settlement to co-exist there are minimum requirements to adhere to , a 1.5 km buffer between Greenstead/ Longridge and the new settlement. A Countrypark must be developed to protect the salary brook valley. Housing must be beyond the tree line at the top of the hill to the East of Greenstead/Longridge. No building South of A133. Rapid transport link needed to include cycle lanes. A link rd needs to connect A120 and A133. Jobs, schools, healthcare must be provided. Development must have Green around it and through it.</p>	<p>None.</p>

6364		Sean Pordham	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	w		<p>The inclusion of a Garden Community at Marks Tey of circa 20,000 homes is ill conceived with none of the concerns raised in early consultations answered i.e.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The GC at Marks Tey is in the wrong place for a new town.</li> <li>2. trunk roads that are congested, highly polluting and have dangerous poor air quality.</li> <li>3. Station is poorly placed with trains already full.</li> <li>4. No meaningful public transport planned until 2030.</li> <li>5. Jobs will be difficult to provide - the councils own consultants cite these difficulties.</li> <li>6. As it stands, the development of a GC at Marks Tey will be nothing more than a commuter town given the current plans.</li> <li>7. 3200 acres of top grade agricultural land to be given over to a commuter town - does not seem a grade deal for the locals at Marks Tey or the Colchester area.</li> <li>8. No clearly defined protection mechanisms in place to ensure the Marks Tey GC will not be built until the infrastructure is in place (roads, rail, public transport, schools and hospitals).</li> </ol>	<p>The inclusion of a Garden Community at Marks Tey of circa 20,000 homes is ill conceived with none of the concerns raised in early consultations answered i.e.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The GC at Marks Tey is in the wrong place for a new town.</li> <li>2. trunk roads that are congested, highly polluting and have dangerous poor air quality.</li> <li>3. Station is poorly placed with trains already full.</li> <li>4. No meaningful public transport planned until 2030.</li> <li>5. Jobs will be difficult to provide - the councils own consultants cite these difficulties.</li> <li>6. As it stands, the development of a GC at Marks Tey will be nothing more than a commuter town given the current plans.</li> <li>7. 3200 acres of top grade agricultural land to be given over to a commuter town - does not seem a grade deal for the locals at Marks Tey or the Colchester area.</li> <li>8. No clearly defined protection mechanisms in place to ensure the Marks Tey GC will not be built until the infrastructure is in place (roads, rail, public transport, schools and hospitals).</li> </ol>
6395		Chris Orme	yes	yes	yes				w		<p>Too much development adjacent to overcrowded development without adequate preservation of existing green belt land.</p>	<p>New development to be beyond the existing wooded area at top of hill.</p>
6433		RSPB	yes	yes	no			✓	A		<p>Point 20 in this policy only commits to protect and/or enhance biodiversity. This is contrary to Policy SP7 above and is not consistent with national policy (paragraph 156).</p>	<p>Remove &amp;/or from point 20 so that it reads:  Protection and enhancement of heritage and biodiversity assets</p>
6435		CPREssex	yes	yes	no			✓	w		<p>CPRE Colchester group recognises that if the necessary infrastructure and delivery mechanism can be secured, then major development in this location would be acceptable, especially given the proximity of the University and its Knowledge Gateway and therefore the likelihood of local employment.</p> <p>It is essential that in any development the Salary Brook valley and adjacent woodland is safeguarded.</p>	<p>It is made clear that any development can only proceed once the necessary delivery mechanism is in place and the supporting infrastructure is in place.</p>
6491		Wendy Fryer	yes	yes	no		✓	✓	✓	w	<p>We have concerns over traffic in the pretty country lanes that are already used as cut through routes for drivers. We consider the area around Crockleford Heath to be a real beauty spot and are concerned it will be lost to a housing estate, perhaps it does not need to be crammed altogether and we can leave space for the gardens and space to walk in and enjoy.</p>	<p>Large green spaces are essential in this area for any additional houses and to conserve the natural environment.</p>
6551		Campaign for the Protection of Rural Essex									<p>East Colchester benefits from and supports the growth of the University, the Knowledge Gateway (one of Colchester's three Strategic Economic Areas), and the town centre. There are, therefore, realistic prospects of local employment for residents of a new community.</p> <p>Infrastructure improvements ahead of development will also be required, but not on the same scale as the West Tey GC proposal.</p> <p>Development of an urban extension to the built up area is less harmful in countryside terms, provided that the Salary Brook valley (including adjoining woodland), is safeguarded.</p> <p>The principle of development in this location is considered justified and effective.</p>	<p>None.</p>

6593		Mersea Homes (ADP Ltd)	yes	yes	no		✓			h	yes	Retaining a green edge to Colchester and placing the proposed country park in the Salary Brook valley are detailed master planning proposals made without proper evaluation of alternative approaches which should correctly be done at the master planning stage in a future development plan document.	In policy SP8, sub paragraph A. 1 delete: 'Safeguarding the important green edge to Colchester will be essential with a new country park provided along the Salary Brook corridor and incorporating Churn Wood.' A full comprehensive track change document of the Colchester Local Plan has been submitted to support all representations made by Mersea Homes [6406]. The document has been attached to the representation made on Policy SP1 [ID: 6515] and can be read in conjunction with each representation.
6602		Manda O'Connell										I support the provision of a green buffer between Colchester East and the proposed new garden community of 1km-1.5km in width and in length from A133 to Bromley Road, and incorporating this area in a country park up to and over the brow of the hill on the opposite side of the Salary Brook valley from Colchester East, and supporting paragraphs 15, 19 and 20 with detailed, sound and robust reasons provided above. This is proposed to meet the needs of the residents and settlements in the new Garden Community, Colchester East, Elmstead Market and Wivenhoe.	None
6617		Martyn Jordan										<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A buffer zone of at least 1.5km needs to be maintained between the East edge of Colchester and the new garden community.</li> <li>2. Establish a country park between the two areas</li> <li>3. Infrastructure e.g. Roads needs to be in place before building starts</li> <li>4. Noise shielding of new roads needs to be provided</li> <li>5. Provision for electric car charging points needs to be provided</li> <li>6. Quality of housing built needs to be comparable with the best in the Colchester area.</li> </ol>	None
6620		Joseph Turner	yes	yes	no					w		All development should be completely out of sight of Longridge and Greenstead resident ie well over the brow of the hill. A green buffer of at least 1.5 km from salary brook and any new development, as supported by Greenstead ward councillors.	The green area around salary brook valley should be designated at a country park for the enjoyment and health of all local residents. Residents should be shielded from traffic noise of any new roads. Public consultation is requested regarding new development and green space.

6711			Ian Shepherd	no	no	yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	w		<p>The plan must make provisions for a 1.5km buffer zone between any new development and existing developments.</p> <p>The local landscape/wildlife/biodiversity must be treated with the utmost respect and must receive minimal disruption/displacement, if any at all.</p> <p>Extra infrastructure must be put in place to cope with the greater strain on resources/services associated with this proposed development.</p> <p>As the area is in a valley, there is severe risk of flooding. this must be addressed if the proposed development is to go ahead.</p> <p>Affordable housing must be a significant proportion of any new development.</p>	<p>Any new development to the East of Colchester in the Tendring/Colchester Borders should be over the brow of the hill and out-of-sight of existing residents of Greenstead and Longridge Park. Ideally, there should be a 1.5km green, undeveloped buffer zone between current housing and any new development. This would help to prevent the surrounding villages becoming part of the conurbation of Colchester and should prevent the arguably outstandingly beautiful views of the area being obscured/spoiled. This idea is supported by the Greenstead Ward councillors.</p> <p>The green, undeveloped area between current and new housing should ideally be dedicated as a 'Country Park', to preserve the delicate ecosystems and biodiversity (including some rare/endorsed native species) and for the enjoyment of the occupants of the up to 9,000 new houses and the existing residents of Greenstead and Longridge Park.</p> <p>Any new road in the area should incorporate noise shielding to prevent disturbance to residents from traffic noise and should not be sited anywhere precarious such as on a steep hill or a sharp bend.</p> <p>The Strategic Growth Development Plan Document for the area should be the subject of public consultation regarding the position of new development and green space.</p> <p>Housing design in the new development should be comparable with the best in Colchester, photos of which have been sent to planners. Please contact Colchester East Action Group for more details.</p> <p>The new development should include references to historical Colchester and its landmarks, in the design of buildings and street names.</p>
6716			Heather Rose	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓		w		<p>Colchester's infrastructure cannot cope with the number of houses it currently has. Schools, doctors and the hospital are at breaking point. Flood risks are a massive issue to the residents of Longridge and the garden community would increase this risk if situated too close. There are many protected species living within the salary brook trail and a massive development would impact negatively upon the wildlife and the wellbeing of the existing residents.</p>	<p>Any development should be at least 1.5km away from the salary brook train and out of view of the existing residents of Longridge. So a buffer zone along the whole trail from the beehive on bromly road to clingo hill of 1.over the brow of the hill. Make the process of stating opinions and objections easier. The questions asked on this form make it difficult to understand unless you are a legal specialist in housing development law.</p>
6726			Karen Coble	no	no	no	✓		✓		w		<p>Infrastructure issues.</p>	<p>Any new roads within the area for the proposed housing should incorporate a noise shield to prevent disturbance to residents from traffic noise. Housing design in the new development should be comparable with the best in Colchester. The new development should include references to historical Colchester, in the design of buildings and street names.</p>



6727		John Coble	no	no	no	✓	✓		w		Boundaries between developments.	The new proposed development to the East of Colchester in the Tendring/Colchester Borders should ideally have a 1.5km buffer between the current housing and any new developments so existing and new residents have sufficient privacy. A dedicated 'Country Park' between current and the proposed new housing would be an ideal for all to enjoy. This could also encourage new wildlife and preserve existing wildlife.	
6747		Mike Lambert	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓		h	yes	Premature pending evidence the Plan is viable and deliverable	Delete. To commit to the NGCs at this early stage would be premature and likely to put at risk the soundness of the Local Plan to deliver in the Plan period to 2033. If at a later date any one or more of the three NGCs proves to be deliverable and viable at a given scale that exceeds the 2500 in the current Plan then this should be brought forward with supporting evidence in a separate DPD at some point in the future, but preferably before development is commenced on any initial phase. The exception may be the NGC for Colchester/Tendring Borders as suggested by Lord Kerslake and CAUSE if the evidence justifies it.
6827		Matthew Rose	yes	no	no	✓	✓	✓		w		Severe risk of flooding will be increased to the residents of Longridge along the salary brook. Infrastructure won't cope with a large number of new homes and the roads of Colchester are awful as it is. This impacts on pollution and commuting time into to the town for work. The schools, doctors and hospital cannot cope with such a large number of new residents and more should be done to ensure unused property is utilised to house people. There is a lot of wildlife in the proposed area and species such as dormice would be at great risk.	Any new development should be situated out of site of the existing residents of Longridge with a 1.5km buffer zone from salary brook up over the hill. Less jargon to be used in the paperwork required to ensure those who object have their objections heard.
6892		Natural England										Acknowledge the aspiration of a country park and the green infrastructure network. Expect the detailed design of the Garden Community to avoid indirect impacts to nearby Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) <sup>2</sup> and Special Protection Area (SPAs) <sup>3</sup> . At paragraph 8.4 the loss of off-site habitat is acknowledged. The requirements for bird survey and assessment, phasing of development and provision of suitable migratory habitats should be translated into policy. Status and timing of proposal for Strategic Growth DPD isn't clear, may not be sound with regards to NPPF given NE concerns on the strength of Policy SP6 with regards to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment.	The requirements for bird survey and assessment, phasing of development and provision of suitable migratory habitats should be translated into policy.

6934		Terry Parker (Fowler Architecture & Planning, Callan Powers)	yes	yes	no		✓	✓		h	yes	The concept of the garden community is supported as a means to deliver sustainable growth in the area. The broad location is not consistent with that set out in TDCs version of the garden communities area of search. The representor's site should be included within this broad area. The Table identifies only 1,250 homes to 2033 which is fewer than stated in SP8, this should be clarified. The policies map should be clarified as to whether this relates to the plan period of potential beyond and it should be ensured that there is consistency with TDC.	The representor's site should be included within this broad area. The Table identifies only 1,250 homes to 2033 which is fewer than stated in SP8, this should be clarified. The policies map should be clarified as to whether this relates to the plan period of potential beyond and it should be ensured that there is consistency with TDC.
6909		Persimmon Homes			no							Persimmon support the creation of the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community. Affordable housing target of 30% shouldn't be referred to as a minimum. Uncapped target does not provide certainty. Persimmon site at St. Johns is deliverable, available and suitable and should be identified as either part of the Garden Community or a separate site in its own right.	
6943		Nigel Mountford	no	no	no					w		Environmentally and ecologically too destructive. Garden communities must work with the environment. Salary Brook nature reserve is one small part of the diverse environment. The surrounding meadows, woodland and green space support a highly diverse ecosystem. Building on the hillside will destroy this. Environmental protection requires more than protection of the nature reserve. Proposals are Colchester overspill/spread. The infrastructure and hospital etc in Colchester are at saturation point. Development should be focussed on the regional peripheries not the core. Harwich/Clacton need major investment not Colchester where house prices are far higher.	None.
6945		Historic England			no							No indication as to how the extent of the garden communities will be determined. Concerned that the new settlements will be housing led rather than considering the landscape and heritage assets and delivering development that has regard to these assets and which would not allow development in certain constrained areas. Development plan documents should be required, through inclusion of an additional criterion in Policy SP8, to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment. See SP7 comments	Add additional criterion in Policy SP8 to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment for DPDs
7013		Peter Kay, C- Bus									yes	CBC's continued talking of P&R as a solution to Colchester traffic congestion problems is wholly reality-phobic, and there is no soundness in any reference to further P&R schemes in the new Local Plan.	

7080		Cllr Tim Young									yes	To enable the existing communities and the new garden settlement to co-exist there are minimum requirements to adhere to , a 1.5 km buffer between Greenstead/ Longridge and the new settlement. A Countrypark must be developed to protect the salary brook valley. Housing must be beyond the tree line at the top of the hill to the East of Greenstead/Longridge. No building South of A133. Rapid transport link needed to include cycle lanes. A link rd needs to connect A120 and A133. Jobs, schools, healthcare must be provided. Development must have green around it and through it.	
7081		Cllr Tina Bourne									yes	To enable the existing communities and the new garden settlement to co-exist there are minimum requirements to adhere to , a 1.5 km buffer between Greenstead/ Longridge and the new settlement. A Countrypark must be developed to protect the salary brook valley. Housing must be beyond the tree line at the top of the hill to the East of Greenstead/Longridge. No building South of A133. Rapid transport link needed to include cycle lanes. A link rd needs to connect A120 and A133. Jobs, schools, healthcare must be provided. Development must have green around it and through it.	
7083		Mr & Mrs A Morgan			no		✓					Predicted growth figures not justified nor sustainable. Colchester has grown so much in recent years and housing figures to provide for local people rather than a huge increase from outside is sufficient.	Reduce the rate of growth in housing numbers over the next 20 years to less than the recent historical rate and avoid expanding the Borough on the periphery, particularly not joining Colchester town to Wivenhoe and Tendring district.
7093		Department of Education and Skills and Funding			no		✓					Policies SP 8, 9 and 10 relate to each of the three proposed Garden Communities. Each policy requires at least one secondary school, primary schools (number and size unspecified) and early-years facilities to be provided to serve new development. The Integrated Delivery Plans for each district provide further details of the number and size of primary and secondary schools required. These details should be included in the above mentioned policies to further demonstrate that the plan has been 'positively prepared' based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed infrastructure requirements.	Include the details referenced in the IDP regarding the number and size of primary and secondary schools required for the new garden community development in Policy SP8 itself.
7100		HBF			no					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> h		In SP7 the target of 30% is clearly set out in part v. However, in Policy SP8 and Policy SP9 these targets are set out is minimums.An essential part of the local plan is to provide certainty to the applicants and to decision makers with regard to new development. Placing a minimum on the affordable housing requirement suggests that a higher proportion may be applicable and is purely a starting point for negotiation. To make these policies sound the affordable housing requirement in SP8, SP9 and SP10 should not be set as minimums.	Affordable targets shouldn't be minimums

7109		Colchester Natural History Society (Peter Hewitt)									yes	CNHS welcomes the statement "Safeguarding the important green edge to Colchester will be essential with a new country park along the Salary Brook corridor and incorporating Churn Wood" and would wish this to be strengthened to reference the vital biodiversity of the area. It would be preferable that the country park area be a designated Local Nature Reserve.	None.
7110		Colchester Natural History Society (Peter Hewitt)									yes	This policy on the proposed east garden community should have embedded within it recognition of the vital biodiversity value of the Salary Brook area and to record the firm proposals to afford the site a protective buffer zone in the form of a new country park or preferably an extended Local Nature Reserve. There is no reference to this which is a serious omission and should be rectified prior to this LP being offered for independent examination. See also CNHS Ref. 1 above.	There is no reference to the vital biodiversity value of the Salary Brook area which is a serious omission and should be rectified prior to this LP being offered for independent examination.
7145		Sport England									yes	Principle 15 is welcomed as it provides the policy basis for ensuring that provision is made for green infrastructure (including outdoor sports facilities), to provides opportunities for new residents to be active. This is a key part of the infrastructure of the development. Principle 16 is also welcomed as it makes provision for the provision of indoor leisure and sports facilities within the new community or off-site. The outdoor and indoor sports facilities strategies prepared or under development as part of the Local Plan evidence base should be used for inform how the development makes provision for indoor/outdoor sport.	
7163		Gladman Development (Mathieu Evans)	yes	yes	no			✓		h	yes	Gladman consider that the garden community on the boundary of Colchester and Tendring will not deliver units as quickly as the council expect and therefore further smaller scale housing sites will be required to be allocated to deliver in the short term. Site specific information on the delivery of all of the garden communities is included in appendix 3 of this representation.	Reduce by 250 dwellings
7204		Kate Mountford	no	no	no							Environmentally bad. Far too close to the nature reserve. The reserve in itself does not support the wide range of species alone, it is the surrounding green area of fields and woods that support the wildlife. If it is to be built it must be buffered by 1-2 km's from the nature reserve and the green area left as nature for all people to enjoy. Colchester can not sustain more expansion. The hospital is at breaking point, schools full and roads horribly congested. Develop the depressed towns in the region not Colchester.	
7207		Joanne Bolderson			X						yes	WE ARE STRONGLY AGAINST ANY OF THE LOCAL PLANNING FOR EXTRA HOUSING. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH, NO MORE BUILDING	no further allocations
7215		Jane Bedford			no		☒	☒	☒	☒	yes	Our Objection to the proposed garden communities are because of :- Inadequate infrastructure - including pressure on water supplies, waste disposal, medical facilities and emergency services, roads and transport. Loss of Greenfield sites - particularly agricultural land Need to utilise existing Brownfield / non greenfield sites for smaller developments prioritising affordable housing.	

7220		Sir Bob Russell			no						yes	<p>Officer Interpretation - Objection to Local Plan on the basis that the plan is unsound and consideration of the points within the main representation should be shown as amendments to the Local Plan text for SP8.</p> <p>Objection to Local Plan on the basis that the plan is unsound and consideration of the points within the main representation should be shown as amendments to the Local Plan text for SP8.</p> <p>There should be commitment in the Colchester Local Plan that there shall be no development in Salary Brook Valley, between Bromley Road and Clinghoe Hill, which is visible when viewed from Greenstead and Longridge - and that any new development to the east of urban Colchester shall be built beyond the brow of the hill. Valley and slopes should be public open space.</p>		
7223		Anthony Barker			no						yes	<p>The outline indication of the published draft strategic land allocations shows the building of an extension to the existing Knowledge Gateway, connected by existing traffic lights to Clingoe Hill and the existing Gateway.</p> <p>This serious blow to the Salary Brook Valley must be averted by placing all new building (Gateway extension, 'Garden Village' or other) beyond the tree belt which forms the skyline of the Valley in this direction (and which must not itself be reduced or damaged).</p>		
7467		Leonie Alpin, Maldon District Council			no			✓				<p>As the planning of the Garden Communities has been delegated down to a Strategic Growth DPD, the strategic areas as shown on the policies maps can be indicative only. It is insufficient to allocate 7,500 homes to these Garden Communities in this plan period, based on an indicative area. To provide more certainty, these areas should be defined more clearly on the Local Plan policies maps. The employment allocation for the Garden Community should be explicitly stated in this policy alongside the housing allocations.</p>		
	39	Ms Sue Dobson Bridleways Development Officer Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		<p>Officer Summary New county park along the Salary Brook corridor is welcomed but should include access for all, including equestrian users to avoid discrimination. Support provision of a network of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways. This commitment should be carried into 8 which should also mention bridleway provision. For the plan to be considered sound access should be possible for ALL users including equestrians.</p>	Incorporate equestrian access as per the comments above.	
	55	Sport England Sport England Planning Manager Eastern Region Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes					No				
	124	Mr Kevin Fraser Principal Planner, Spatial Planning Team Essex County Council Spatial Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes			✓		No		<p>The change refers to the transport network rather than merely the road network. Change Policy SP8, D7 as follows: Longer term transport interventions will need to be carefully designed to minimise the impacts on the strategic and local transport (rather than road) network and fully mitigate any environmental or traffic impacts arising from the development. These shall include bus (or other public transit provisions) priority measures between the site, University of Essex, Hythe station and Colchester Town Centre;</p>	Change 'road network' to 'transport network'	

232		Mr Stuart McAdam	Yes	Yes	No		✓	✓	✓	Yes		Persimmon Homes strongly suggest Braintree is at risk of not being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply during in the course of the plan period and the delivery of sufficient housing within the overall Plan period. The Draft Local Plan does not: -adequately consider increased migration from London - impact of London not meeting its own housing need - Effectively assess key market signals In order to future proof the plan, it is suggested that the Council should seek to allocate reserved sites which can be brought forward if Braintree see an increase in their housing needs	It is considered that an uncapped target does not provide certainty and could place a policy burden that would threaten viability. The market and purchasing decisions factor in policy requirements and not having clarity would give rise to significant uncertainty that would not assist delivery.
239		Mr Bill Newman Corporate Manager - Strategic Planning Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Council	Yes	Yes	Yes					No		Babergh District Council is currently working with Ipswich Borough Council and Suffolk Coastal District Council on the production of a Recreation Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) which will set out mitigation measures for the Stour and Orwell Estuaries Special Protection Area, and therefore the reference to a similar approach potentially being followed by Braintree, Colchester and Tendring is supported. Mitigation measures identified in a RAMS for Braintree, Colchester and Tendring should be consistent with those contained in the RAMS being produced by Babergh, Ipswich and Suffolk Coastal. The Council would wish to be consulted during its production.	
247		Environment Agency Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No				✓	No			Item 17 should be re-worded along the following lines: Provision of improvements, ahead of development, to waste water treatment plant including an upgrade to the Colchester Waste Water Treatment Plan in accordance with the programme set out in the Colchester Infrastructure Delivery Plan and off-site drainage improvements. The purpose here is to set out a clear signposting of infrastructure delivery requirements as evaluated under the CIDP. It should be noted that the priority for this infrastructure is described as critical under Table 13.1 which is presumably a reflection of its importance.
324		Choice Construction Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
326		Barkley Projects Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
327		Mr Watson-Steele Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
328		Mr Gavin Day DSG Developments Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.

329		Mr D P Nott Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
330		Granville Developments Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
331		Mr Lightly Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
332		Mrs D Golding Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
333		Mr W Kerry Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
334		Pertwee Estates Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
335		Mr G Williamson Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
336		Mrs J Scarlett Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
338		Mrs J Sawyer Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.

339		Mr C Coghlan Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
340		Mr R Carter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
342		Mr M Harrington Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
343		Mr Martin Cowan Poplar Nurseries Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
345		Mr M Spurgeon Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
347		Mr D Clough Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
348		Mr & Mrs Harrison Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
349		The Shepherd Trust Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.



350		Mr C Reid Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
351		Mr D White Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
352		Mssrs Parmenter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
353		Mrs D Morrall Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
354		Mr C Hart Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
355		Mr M Allard Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes		The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.
529		Consultation Service Natural England	Yes	Yes	No					Yes		O/S - The recommendations of the AA Section 1 Report regarding adequate water treatment infrastructure capacity to avoid impacts on the Stour and Orwell Estuaries and Colne Estuary SPAs and Ramsar sites, and the Essex Estuaries SAC, is recognised. However we advise that adequate water treatment infrastructure should be included in a Policy as a safeguard to ensure that the phasing of development does not exceed capacity, consistent with our previous advice of 28 June 2017.	
549		Mr Phil Bamford Planning Manager Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		Gladman consider that the Garden Communities will not deliver units as quickly as the Council expect and therefore further smaller scale housing sites will be required to be allocated to deliver in the short term.	

588		Mr Oliver Marigold Principle Planner Tetlow King Planning	Yes	Yes	No				✓	No	We consider that a number of amendments are necessary to the Publication Draft Local Plan, to ensure that the full opportunity of a rent to buy model is included within the definition of affordable housing.	See above
599		Mrs Carol Richards Diocese of Chelmsford	Question not answered	Question not answered	No					Question not answered	For Policy SP8 to be sound places of worship needs to be included in the list of community services and facilities. Since the NPPF specifically mentions places of worship this policy SP8 should also specifically mention places of worship as it cannot be assumed that places of worship are included if they are not mentioned. The most appropriate place to add this information is point 12 Community meeting places will be provided within the local centres including places of worship .	For Policy SP8 to be sound places of worship needs to be included in the list of community services and facilities. Since the NPPF specifically mentions places of worship this policy SP8 should also specifically mention places of worship as it cannot be assumed that places of worship are included if they are not mentioned. The most appropriate place to add this information is point 12 Community meeting places will be provided within the local centres including places of worship .
610		Mr James Stevens Home Builders Federation	Yes	Yes	No				✓	Yes	O/S - Part 3 of SP8, SP9 and SP10 are unsound and not consistent with national policy  We welcome the identification of three new settlements across the North Essex HMA. This shows not only a commitment to delivering housing for this plan period but beyond. To make these policies sound the affordable housing requirement in SP8, SP9 and SP10 should not be set as minimums.	Based on both increased migration from London and concerns regarding affordability we would suggest the following OANs for each of the three Councils forming part of the North Essex area: Braintree 762 dpa (623 starting point plus 12 units for London migration scenario and a 20% uplift) Colchester 1002 dpa (866 starting point plus 45 units for London migration scenario and a 10% uplift) Tendring 776 dpa (675 plus 15% uplift) This level of delivery would require the North Essex HMA to deliver 2540 homes per annum, a total of 50,800 new homes between 2013 and 2033.
630		Mr Douglas McNab Forward Planning Manager - South East Education and Skills Funding Agency Department For Education	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	The ESFA also welcomes the focus in policy SP7 on the sequencing of development and infrastructure provision to ensure that the latter is provided ahead of or in tandem with the development it supports. Policies SP 8, 9 and 10 relate to each of the three proposed Garden Communities. Each policy requires at least one secondary school, primary schools (number and size unspecified) and early-years facilities to be provided to serve new development. The Integrated Delivery Plans for each district provide further details of the number and size of primary and secondary schools required. These details should be included in the above mentioned policies to further demonstrate that the plan has been positively prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed infrastructure requirements.	
646		Dr Natalie Gates Principal Advisor, Historic Places Team Historic England	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Question not answered	O/S - How will the extent of the garden communities be established. Need for a reference to Heritage Impact Assessment. Need for reference to safeguarding buffers around heritage assets.	
649		NHS Mid Essex CCG NHS Mid Essex Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Yes	Please amend policy SP8, SP9, SP10, section E. Community Infrastructure, point 13 to read increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities.	Please amend policy SP8, SP9, SP10, section E. Community Infrastructure, point 13 to read increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities.

	652		NHS Property Services Ltd NHS Property Services Ltd (NHSPS)	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Yes		Please amend policy SP8, SP9, SP10, section E. Community Infrastructure, point 13 "to read increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities.	Please amend policy SP8, SP9, SP10, section E. Community Infrastructure, point 13 "to read increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities.
	655		NHS England NHS England (NHSE)	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Yes		Please amend policy SP8, SP9, SP10, section E. Community Infrastructure, point 13 "to read increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities.	
		LPPD10	Mr Andrew Martin, Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	No		✓	✓	✓			Objection is raised to Policy SP8, which identifies a broad location on the borders of Tendring and Colchester for a new Garden Community of circa 7,000-9,000 new homes, of which 2,500 dwellings are deemed to be deliverable within the plan period. The num	[Officer interpretation] Allocate additional sites for housing to meet the objectively assessed need.
		LPPD25	Mr Andrew Hunter, Planning Advisor - Sustainable Places Team Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No	✓						Item 17 under should include a reference to the expected timetable/programme. As matters stand there is no reference to any requirement for essential waste water infrastructure to be delivered ahead of residential development. Delivery of infrastructure is an important component of the master planning process for the Garden Community.	Item 17 should be re-worded along the following lines: "Provision of improvements, ahead of development, to waste water treatment including an upgrade to the Colchester Waste Water Treatment Plan in accordance with the programme set out in the Braintree Infrastructure Delivery Plan and off-site drainage improvements". The purpose here is to set out a clear signposting of infrastructure delivery requirements.
		LPPD28	Mark Norman, Highways	Yes	Yes	No			✓				[Officer summary] It is unclear on how the Garden Community is proposed to access the existing A120. Depending on the type of junction, could impact on the free-flow of A120 traffic. An economic business case will need to demonstrate the need for a link road and what the effects would be, before we could agree to the creation of a new junction. Increased focus will need to be placed on encouraging model shift, as most journeys to work are by car. It is recommended to improve access to railway stations by sustainable modes, given the high level of trips between settlements with rail links. A12, A120 junction (J29) is operating very close to capacity at present and is hemmed in by development which could make improvement very difficult and expensive. We look forward to working with you to deliver growth in Tendring District.	None.
		LPPD38	Historic Environment Planning Adviser, Historic England	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓				The development plan documents for each settlement should be required, through inclusion of an additional criterion in Policy SP8 to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment in order to assess impact of the proposed allocation upon the historic environment, inform the appropriate extent of the development and establish any mitigation measures necessary. The proposed garden community could have a significant detrimental impact on the setting of these heritage assets.	Part F (para 20) should be strengthened and amended to include reference to the heritage assets and the need to have regard to their setting when preparing more detailed planning frameworks for the site.
		LPPD43	Mr Geoff Armstrong, Armstrong Rigg	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓			[Officer summary] Based on our analysis, the scheme is predicted to deliver only 1,047 dwellings which is far below the delivery of 2,500 dwellings during the plan period and would result in just over 500 dwellings to contribute to Tendring's housing supply against a prediction of 1,250.	Policies SP7 and SP8 should be amended to identify a predicted delivery of 1,000 homes from the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community during the plan period and Policy LP1 should be amended to identify a delivery of 500 homes in Tendring. It is clear from the above that there will be a need for several hundred new homes to be planned for in Tendring's emerging Local Plan.

		LPPD45	Mr Mark Behrendt	Yes	Yes	No									In SP7 the absolute target of 30% is clearly set out in part v. However, in Policy SP8 and Policy SP9 these targets are set out in minimums. An essential part of the local plan is to provide certainty to the applicants and to decision makers with regard to new development. Placing a minimum on the affordable housing requirement suggests that a higher proportion may be applicable and is purely a starting point for negotiation. The local plan must be clear as to the target it is seeking in order to provide a clear pricing signal to the market. This can then be factored into the price of land by developers when seeking to acquire land in these areas. To make these policies sound the affordable housing requirement in SP8, SP9 and SP10 should not be set as minimums.	To make these policies sound the affordable housing requirement in SP8, SP9 and SP10 should not be set as minimums.
		LPPD50	Miss Jane Mower, Estates Programme Manager NHS England and NEECCG and NHSPS	Yes	Yes	No			✓						Please amend point 13 to read "increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities".	Please amend point 13 to read "increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities".
		LPPD53	Tetlow King, Tetlow King Planning	Yes	Yes	No			✓						To further bolster the individual strategic site allocation policies the Council should seek refer to the need to provide a range of affordable housing, including rent to buy, to reflect the emerging national policy approach. Furthermore in the interests of clarity, the term "affordable housing" should be capitalised, to make clear it refers to the definition in the Glossary.	We recommend the following amendment to this policy: A mix of housing types and tenures including self- and custom-build and starter homes will be provided on the site, including a minimum of 30% Affordable Housing including rent to buy to reflect local needs and aspirations. ...".
		LPPD62	Major David Casey	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓						[Officer summary] The Tendring Colchester Border Garden Community map has no key. The proposal appears effectively desecrate the Salary Brook Valley which has a delightful character of its own and is a natural beauty spot of great landscape and ecological significance. The whole of this area is a high quality green belt locality and should, in conjunction with CBC be turned into a Country Park to be protected in perpetuity for the people of Colchester and North Essex.	[Officer interpretation] Designate Salary Brook Valley as a Country Park.
		LPPD60	Mr Matthew Utting, Director MatPlan Limited	Yes	Yes	No			✓						[Officer summary] Specific boundaries for the Garden Community have yet to be determined, let alone a Masterplan Framework devised, consulted upon and adopted to guide the proposal's delivery. The submission and approval of a planning application for the Garden Community must be some years away. The delivery rates required to achieve 1,250 dwellings for Tendring in the plan period are over-optimistic and there is insufficient evidence to support these assumptions – particularly as the garden community lies within a Minerals Safeguarding Area which could cause significant delay.	[Officer interpretation] Allocate additional sites for housing to meet the objectively assessed need.
		LPPD67	Mr David Moseley, Strategic Planner Persimmon Homes	Yes	Yes	Yes									[Officer summary] Persimmon Homes object to the affordable housing target of 30%(set out in Policies SP8, 9 and 10) being a"minimum". The Local Plan must set out clearly the target it is seeking to achieve and, in line with Para 173 of the NPPF, assess the implications for development viability having regard to the scale of obligations and policy burdens of the development plan as a whole. It is considered that an uncapped target does not provide certainty and could place a policy burden that would threaten viability. The market and purchasing decisions factor in policy requirements and not having clarity would give rise to significant uncertainty that would not assist delivery.	[Officer interpretation] Do not require 30% affordable housing as a minimum in Policies SP8, 9 or 10.

		LPPD80	Jill Hughes, AM Planning	Yes	Yes	No		✓	✓	✓			The number of homes attributable to Tendring, within the plan period, is 1,250. The proposed new Garden Community will necessitate the preparation of a site-specific DPD in order to allocate the specific site and before any planning permission can be granted, free from the risk of call-in by the Secretary of State. This could lead to lengthy timescales and delay.	Identify additional sustainable housing sites in accordance with the spatial hierarchy for growth set out in Part 2 of the Plan for Tendring. This will boost housing supply in the early years of the plan period. To achieve this a number of small to medium size sites will need to be identified, such as land to the south of Weeley Road in the settlement of Great Bentley.
		LPPD58	Callan Powers, Fowler Architecture and PLanning Ltd (FAAP)	Yes	Yes	Yes							[Officer summary] The Policy mentions a proposal for around 2,500 dwellings within the Plan period and potential for between 7,000-9,000 dwellings. However, it is not clear whether this relates to all or part of the green shaded area on Map B.7, or indeed whether this relates to purely land within Tendring District. The Map on B.7 therefore should be clarified as to whether this relates to the plan-period, or the obvious potential beyond; also it should be amended to show the strategic context in Colchester Borough Council to identify the broad extents of the Garden Community. An objection exists to the use of two shades of green on Map B.7 as it is unclear what these represent. Any distinguishing of land use within the Garden Community is unsupported by any published masterplan at this stage and is premature of the decisions to be taken in the Strategic Growth DPD. Early consultation must be undertaken with all affected landowners within this broad location for growth as part of the Strategic Growth DPD process.	[Officer interpretation] Make the plan clearer in terms of where the dwellings will be built.
		LPPD90	Phil Bamford, Gladman	Yes	Yes	No			✓				[Officer summary] With the need to prepare the Strategic Growth DPD, along with a significant amount of land assembly to be undertaken, the need for a considerable amount of infrastructure to be provided and the expectation that the development will involve two authorities, Gladman consider that there will be significant lead-in times associated with the site which calls into question its ability to deliver 2,500 units by 2033. Policy SP8 also sets out a comprehensive and detailed list of requirements which will need to be provided as part of the development of the garden community. Smaller scale housing sites will therefore be required to plug the inevitable gap in housing supply.	[Officer interpretation] Allocate additional sites for housing to meet the objectively assessed need.
		LPPD70	Trevor Dodkins, Phase 2 Planning & Development Ltd	Yes	Yes	No							[Officer summary] In reality, it is highly likely that commencement on site would take longer to achieve than currently anticipated. In this location, it might be expected that a strategic development, once output reaches full production, could deliver in the order of 100 - 150 dwellings per annum - only 1500 units within the Plan period, not 2,500. The innovative Local Delivery Vehicles to help deliver the new garden communities themselves represents a further potential hurdle to the early commencement of the new garden communities, as the new legal and procedural arrangements for delivery will need to be in place in advance of commencement of construction.	[Officer interpretation] Allocate additional sites for housing to meet the objectively assessed need.
		LPPD105	Sir Bob Russell			No							There should be NO development on the eastern slopes of Salary Brook Valley as viewed from urban Colchester - Greenstead and Longridge. There should be no urban eastwards extension of Colchester. Undeveloped land should be protected. The rural character of land to the east of Colchester must be retained. The whole Valley - and slopes - should remain as open space, and designated as public open space.	Amend A to include: "Safeguarding the important green edge to Colchester will be essential with a new country park provided along the Salary Brook corridor and incorporating Churn Wood." Amend E to include reference to " ..... a new country park provided along the Salary Brook corridor and incorporating Churn Wood ....." "



6059		Robert Suckling	no	no	no	✓				w		Policy SP9 is in direct conflict with the aims laid out in the National Planning Policy Framework and should be dropped.	Remove policy SP9. Introduce a Policy to develop the area's major settlements further, thereby minimising the effects of development on the local environment.
6089		Ruth Eyre-Pugh	yes	yes	no		✓			w		About D7:specifically the suggestion to relocate the newly refurbished Marks Tey railway station into the centre of the new garden community.	Relocation of Marks Tey station would inconvenience the railway users who live on the Sudbury side of Marks Tey station as we would have to travel into the centre of the new garden community. If using the branch line and the connection is missed then family members would have to travel considerably further to collect passengers from Marks Tey. Waste of money if the recently refurbished station is closed.
6095		Philip Jellard			no							I submit below some short comments on why I consider the Local Plan SP9 is not sound: a) the trains will not manage with the commuters living in the 23,000 houses, b) the road infrastructure is wholly inadequate and the A120 dualling between Braintree and the A12 needs to be operational before any houses are built, c) the area would destroy important Grade 2 agricultural land.	
6109		Richard Waylen										As long as A12 and A120 are improved first	
6121		George Beach	yes		no		✓	✓				no summary provided	A much smaller development should be considered over a much larger area which will enable the existing infrastructure to absorb it.
6192		Asa Aldis	no	no								House prices are going to be between 60 and 80k more the London side of Colchester and this makes the West much more profitable and therefore presents a significantly reduced risk to Colchester tax payers.	None
6230		Feering Parish Council	yes	no	no		✓	✓		h		Feering Parish Council wish to see green buffers designated & shown on the proposals maps. The green buffers are to prevent the coalescence of the eastern edge of Feering Parish with the western edge of the proposed garden community. Such coalescence would lead to the detriment of the character and rural setting of the hamlets on the eastern / NE side of Feering village and to the listed building of Prested Hall. The limited location of these green buffers would not contradict national planning policy as it not a wholesale designation of swathes of countryside.	Green buffers designated and shown on the proposals maps as follows: a) in an eastern arc around and historic centre and conservation area of Feering village which includes the church (Grade I Listed) and green plus various listed buildings b) around the tranquil rural hamlets of Skye Green, Langley Green and Stocks Green which include the listed buildings Cockerell's Farmhouse & The Old Cottage in Skye Green, Poplar Hall & Old Wills farmhouse on Little Tey Road c) around Prested Hall, Grade II listed. Protect the landscape around Langley Green
6233		Stephen Thompson	no	yes	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	w		The proposed local plan is unsound, as the published proposals for a garden community at West Tey fall well short of the requirements for garden communities in terms of local job creation and sustainable transport. the proposal would create a commuter town reliant on existing rail capacity to London, and commuting by private car to existing employment centres in Colchester and beyond. This is in direct conflict with the stated aims of a garden community. Furthermore, as it would be divided by two major roads and a railway, it would be an unpleasant commuter town to live in.	West Tey is not a suitable sight for a development of this size. It is difficult to imagine any changes that could be made to make it suitable.

6238		Feering Parish Council	yes	no	no		✓	✓	✓	h	yes	(i) Section 1 of the Publication Draft Local Plans is stated as being the same for Braintree, Colchester & Tendring but in terms of maps this is not the case. (ii) The "adopted policies map" referred to in the first sentence of policies SP8, SP9 & SP10 is not included in Section 1 of the Local Plan document. (iii) Different maps at different scales are included. The western, northern & southern edges of the proposed garden community differ between the maps. This lack of commonality means that the extent of the proposed garden community is unclear.	A. "adopted policies map(s)" are included in SP8, SP9 and SP10 as stated. B. As Section 1 of the Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Publication Draft Local Plans is stated to be common, that the same set of maps are included & inconsistencies are rectified C. that a consistent set of maps showing the entire extent of each of the Colchester/Braintree bordered garden community to the same scale are produced and included. That the same maps are used in the various evidence base documents. A common sets of maps is necessary for consistency, for assessment and to reduce confusion by facilitating a direct visual comparison of the extent of the proposed garden communities.
6245		Paul Twohey	yes	yes	yes					w	yes	see attached representation	Scrap the Garden Community on the Colchester / Braintree border as economically unviable.
6263		Diocese of Chelmsford (Church of England)	yes	yes	no			✓		h		Section E Community Infrastructure is not compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework because it does not mention places of worship. Section 70 of the NPPF states: "To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should: plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments."	For Policy SP9 to be sound "places of worship" needs to be included in the list of community services and facilities. Since the NPPF specifically mentions "places of worship" this policy SP9 should also specifically mention "places of worship" as it cannot be assumed that "places of worship" are included if they are not mentioned. The most appropriate place to add this information is point 13 "Community meeting places will be provided within the district and local centres including places of worship".
6288		Marks Tey Church										D7 and D11: A recent survey by Marks Tey Parish Council indicated that the majority of rail commuters arrive by car, and parking is full. The landscape around the road bridge over the railway to North Lane allows for multi-storey car parks to be built from rail level upwards without significant impact on the surrounding views. This would provide additional parking capacity.	None
6291		Marks Tey Church										F.25: the half a dozen churches in or bordering the Garden Community area would like to help with building new communities, helping govern and support community assets and facilities, and linking with council support workers. This is a genuine offer, based on past and present community engagement, often undervalued; and not for partisan reasons but for community benefit. I am the Vicar of Marks Tey & Aldham.	None
6296		Richard Gough										With its excellent transport links this seems to be an excellent location for a new garden community.	
6303		Anglia Water	yes	yes	no			✓		A		Reference is made to an upgrade to Colchester waste water treatment plant and off-site improvements to the foul sewerage network which is welcomed.  It would be helpful to 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.	It is therefore proposed that Policy SP9 is amended as follows:  'Provision of improvements to waste water treatment including an upgrade to the Colchester Waste Water Treatment Plant and off-site drainage improvements to be aligned with the phasing of the development within the plan period and that proposed post 2033.'



6407		Stephen Whitfield	yes	no	no		✓	✓	✓	w		This is a very bad plan for the whole area. Trains, roads, schools and healthcare are already under great strain. Another 40,00 cars will ruin air quality even further. I think the fact that we will lose so much of our countryside for a town that will be mainly for commuters is a badly thought out exchange. In a time of austerity how can this plan be affordable and sustainable. When I use the train the station at Marks Tey is difficult to access. The consultants appointed by CAUSE indicate that it cannot cope.	none - this is a badly thought throw proposal
6450		Robert Frost	yes	no	no		✓	✓	✓	w		There is inadequate infrastructure and no plans or funding to improve the A120 or GEML train line. It involves the loss of high quality Grade 2 agricultural land when poorer quality land is available elsewhere. Lastly, 2 Garden Communities are too much for CBC and they should learn from the simpler East of Colchester development this plan period and then consider Colchester/Braintree in future plan periods, armed with clarity on A120 improvements.	Remove Colchester/Braintree border Garden Community and focus on East of Colchester Garden Community
6552		Campaign to Protect Rural Essex	yes	yes	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	h		The location and scale of West Tey GC is inappropriate and unjustified - particularly given the unknown timings and likelihood of critical transport infrastructure improvements required in advance.	We suggest this to be an 'immature' project with too large a number of project unknowns - eg route and timing of A120 dualling; route and timing of A12 widening; upgrades to GEML; location of a new station on GEML; relocation of the Sudbury branch line; variety of mass rapid transit options under consideration with massive early cost ranges. The infrastructure requirements to ensure that West Tey succeeds as a garden community, are therefore too high, both in terms of financial viability and practical deliverability. Therefore the proposed garden community to the west of Colchester should be dropped from the Plan.
6823		William Sunnucks	no	no	no		✓	✓	✓	h		West Tey is the wrong place for a garden community. It will be at a &quot;comparative disadvantage&quot; in generating local jobs for residents. It will be a commuter town, overloading the Great Eastern Mainline. It cannot be started until the A120 is dualled. It will need massive government subsidy if the promised infrastructure is to be built. Its inclusion in the local plan is massively premature and damaging.	Policy SP9 should be deleted.
6826		Alan Baxter	no	no	yes		✓		✓	w		Proposal for garden community would mean higher than average house prices, (just because the development has been given this title) and no provision has been made for reasonably priced properties for purchase for starter homes and those wishing to down size. The economic basis for this proposal has not been made and it is unclear where the jobs would come from. It is just creating a comuter town that the railway will not cope with. The map provided has unclear boundaries and is not helpful. You need to ensure there are adequate doctors and police to cope before building.	Smaller developments close to existing towns away from rural areas. Consideration should be given to relocating Colchester hospital to provide better facilities with more car parking and using the existing site for housing.
6329		Richard Gore	no	no	no		✓	✓				The railway station is too far a walk from much of the proposed development site, developments would slow traffic, cause greater traffic load onto roads never planned to take amount of traffic presently.  There would also be a loss of high grade farm land  Preliminary benefit those from outside the area.  Likely to benefit individuals/couples working in London rather not working in and around Colchester.  Create increase pollution, noise and fumes.  Increase the serious issue of over crowding on the trains into London.  Destroy the rural setting around the nearby villages.	Any further development should be further from London and in areas that were less well off, such as Jaywick, Clacton and further north in East Anglia.

6365		Sean Pordham	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	w		The inclusion of a Garden Community at Marks Tey of circa 20,000 homes is ill conceived with none of the concerns raised in early consultations answered i.e. 1. The GC at Marks Tey is in the wrong place for a new town. 2. trunk roads that are congested and highly polluting and have dangerous poor air quality. 3. Station is poorly placed with trains already full. 4. No meaningful public transport planned until 2030. 5. Jobs will be difficult to provide - the councils own consultants cite these difficulties.	The inclusion of a Garden Community at Marks Tey of circa 20,000 homes is ill conceived with none of the concerns raised in early consultations answered i.e. 1. The GC at Marks Tey is in the wrong place for a new town. 2. trunk roads that are congested and highly polluting and have dangerous poor air quality. 3. Station is poorly placed with trains already full. 4. No meaningful public transport planned until 2030. 5. Jobs will be difficult to provide - the councils own consultants cite these difficulties.
6426		CAUSE (Rosie Pearson)	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓	A	yes	A Local Plan which includes Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community is not sound. It is not a deliverable, viable or sustainable option, nor will it meet infrastructure requirements of its own population or the current local population of Braintree District and Colchester Borough. This is not the most appropriate strategy, and the evidence does not support the inclusion of SP9 in the Plan. See full CAUSE response: <a href="http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf">http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf</a>  *NB Officers note: supporting documents attached to REP. Cause represents 1125 individuals.	SP9 should be dropped from the Plan. See Appendix 1 (page 12 <a href="http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf">http://www.cause4livingessex.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CAUSE-2017-Part-1-Consultation-response.pdf</a> )
6436		RSPB	yes	yes	no			✓	A		Point 21 only commits to the Protection and/or enhancement of heritage and biodiversity assets. This is not consistent with the NPPF (paragraph 156), nor the principle outlined in SP7.	Remove and/or so that it reads Protection and enhancement of heritage and biodiversity assets
6439		CPREssex	yes	yes	no	✓	✓	✓	w		Too large a development with serious adverse impact on the countryside, farmland and the character and setting of a number of villages with no certainty that the necessary infrastructure will be in place.	Deletion of the proposal.
6461		Susan Stacey	yes	yes	yes		✓		w		Some of the best and most versatile agricultural land in England will be lost to housing with few employment opportunities for residents. The plan relies on reduced car use but regular public transport will never cover all places people need to go and also to be able to transport items needed for work or leisure. Not all purchases can be balanced on the handlebars of a bike or taken on a bus so more people will turn to Amazon and retailers will go to the wall.	Reject. It is not justified for the reasons stated above
6468		Cllr Peter Chillingworth			no				w		West Tey inclusion in the Plan is premature, because of; 1. No economic base 2. No certainty regarding transport infrastructure, especially A120 3. Same applies to railways improvements, health facilities, etc. 4. Managing 2 LDVs is over ambitious, do East Colchester first to gain expertise. 5. Low quality agricultural land should be developed at Middlewick before high quality at West Tey. 6. South Colchester should be developed to release funds for necessary transport infrastructure before greenfield land to the west of Colchester.	Delete West Tey

6493		Andrew Martin (representing Crest Nicholson)	yes	yes	no	✓	✓	✓	✓	A	Yes	To accord with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the NPPF and PPG, identification of land at Marks Tey to be promoted as a Garden Community should be shown on the Proposals Map in Section 2 of the Colchester Plan as an 'area of search'. To meet housing need in the early years of the Plan a separate allocation or first phase of the Garden Community should be shown on the Proposals Map and added to the housing trajectory.	National planning policy sets clear expectations as to how a Local Plan must be developed in order for it to be justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively prepared to deliver sustainable development that meets local needs and national priorities. To accord with this guidance it is submitted that the identification of land at Marks Tey to be promoted as a new Garden Community should be clearly shown on the Proposals Map for the Colchester Plan, Section 2, as a precisely defined 'area of search'. A separate allocation should also be made in Section 2 of the Plan for a free standing development or a first phase of the new Garden Community. This should be shown on the Proposals Map and added to the housing trajectory to commence within the first five years of the Local Plan.  Such revisions would, with proper planning, not prejudice the larger and longer term Garden Community. It would be possible to plan and incorporate the first phase area into a strategic concept masterplan and framework for the Garden Community. The first phase could therefore act as a gateway development and establish the high quality design and environmental standards to be followed in the larger Garden Community.
6601		Carol Baxter	no	no	yes		✓		✓	w		This proposal as it stands does not make a case for sustainable development and the economic case has not been made. The proposal does not meet National Planning Policy Framework guidance and will significantly increase our carbon footprint.	Consideration to smaller developments close to existing towns and facilities. Provision of cheaper properties to purchase for first time buyers and for those wishing to down size. Look at more innovative solutions for providing affordable rental properties. Look to enhance and develop communities that are truly self supporting with far less reliance on importing food and commuting to London.
6665		David Butler	yes	no	yes	✓				w		West Tey as proposed is too rushed, too big and will place an impossible burden on the existing overloaded transport and community based infrastructure. Without better job prospects it is also unsustainable and will develop into a commuter town. Any new development in this corridor, except minor infilling, must await a new link road and junction to the A12. To advocate earlier development against Lord Kerslake's advice is unsound and opportunistic, losing valuable arable land for windfall profits to the landowners and perhaps the Council with a consequential unacceptable increase in air pollution levels.	1 No West Tey to be considered until A120 duelled and new link road to the A12 has been built. 2 The development proposed is too big, too rushed and other sites are available within the plan's timeframe to provide these numbers required, e.g. MOD land Middlewick Ranges and land to the south of Marks Tey on the fringe of the village envelope. This delay would allow more time for a better plan to be developed for the period after 2033 including better integration with the future infrastructure then available.

6704		Jane Richardson	yes	no	yes	✓	✓			w	<p>Cut back the amount of houses to 5000 maximum. Only start when new roads eg A120 and infrastructure are in place.</p> <p>Check figures for the amount of housing in this area of Essex is absolutely necessary; it seems that too many houses are being built in one area and my instinct is to question this figure.</p> <p>Include churches and places of worship included in the plan and also ensure that signed agreements are agreed with developers to pay for new schools,, surgeries, churches, community and healthcare buildings.</p>	I have supported the local group CAUSE and have signed petitions and have given CAUSE permission to represent my views. I haven't raised the matter before as it seems such an enormous plan and I felt rather overwhelmed by it.
6724		Robin Young								w	<p>Leaving Colchester via non-A12 route Marks Tey is the first place on the A120 to have farmed fields. I feel this marks the edge of rural Essex and should not be built on in vast numbers in order to keep the identity of the existing 'villages' and thus ensure the preservation of the nature of Essex County. Also, until the new A120 is built many choices will not be available to comment on and traffic flows will only be projections like those for the M25 and in particular the Dartford Crossing.</p>	Expand the existing 'villages' and allow building upto the Stanway/Copford line. Place a restriction on on-street parking in new residential areas. Marks Tey now has many five-car households which would become much higher in a 'Carden Commutercity'
6748		Mike Lambert	no	no	no	✓	✓	✓		h	<p>The expectation on employment growth are ambitious not but supported by the evidence</p>	The policy needs amending to ensure that whilst flexibility is retained to changing demands in the commercial market, there is not an oversupply of land based on an unrealistic assumption about job growth.
6840		Messing cum Inworth Parish Council	yes	no	yes				✓	w	<p>the area of search is too large and too fluid, there is no Plan B if the Braintree/Colchester Garden village is not located by proposed A20/A12. 'green barriers 'need to be defined in the plan, to avoid villages /communities being enveloped into west Tey, the plan needs to be economically justified, infrastructure for current population required before new builds. consultation/potential location for Tiptree spur road on/off the A12 needs to be defined,</p>	detailed plans regarding the site location for the proposed Garden community need to be laid out - at present the number of properties/villages affected is too large- answers such as 'it is the area of site' and there will be 'green areas at the edge of the site' are insufficient . this has changed since the last phase of the consultation. There must be clear definition and separation of villages. Regarding the potential slip road for traffic from the Tiptree area to /from the A12- either need to be presented on a plan or a separate consultation to justify the location, this plan cannot be signed off with such 'vague' plans.
6844		Dawn Marriott	yes	no	yes	✓			✓	w	<p>the area of search is too large and too fluid, there is no Plan B if the Braintree/Colchester Garden village is not located by proposed A20/A12. 'green barriers 'need to be defined in the plan, to avoid villages /communities being enveloped into west Tey, the plan needs to be economically justified, infrastructure for current population required before new builds. consultation/potential location for Tiptree spur road on/off the A12 needs to be defined,</p>	alternative plans for development if the A120 is not to be via Marks Tey. detailed" green barriers' to be built into the plan to stop development overrunning surrounding villages ( and to protect open spaces). Economic justification to be proven. further discussion/ Consultation/ potential routes for new Road for Tiptree traffic ( not just a spur road to the B1023)
6818		Marian Hamer	yes	no	yes		✓	✓	✓	w	<p>No infrastructure for a garden community, and no immediate plans to improve current services.</p> <p>Poorer quality land should be considered before using prime agricultural land. Smaller communities will be swallowed up by vast development.</p> <p>No prospect of large scale employment to make a garden community self sustaining</p>	Remove west Colchester garden community from the plan
6803		Marks Tey Parish Council (PJPC Ltd)	yes	no	yes	✓		✓	✓	h	<p>Clearer reference to the Garden Community principles should be included. The policy should be more precise and positive as to what is expected in terms of integration with Marks Tey by reference to built environment, traffic, enhancements and retention of village identity and access to countryside. The potential sharing of facilities with suitable links is welcomed but there needs to be a degree of separation. There should be clear reference to the need for the A120 issues to be resolved and how transitional arrangements will be put in place.</p>	Include items as referred to above as part of the requirements.

6893		Natural England											Previous advice has largely been included. Adequate water treatment infrastructure should be included in a policy as a safeguard to ensure that phasing of development does not exceed capacity. Status and timing of proposal for Strategic Growth DPD isn't clear, may not be sound with regards to NPPF given NE concerns on the strength of Policy SP6 with regards to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment.	Adequate water treatment infrastructure should be included in a policy.
6910		Persimmon Homes			no						yes		Officer summary -Welcome identification of three new settlements across North Essex HMA, but targets for affordable housing should not be set out as minimums	remove requirement for affordable housing target to be minimum.
6946		Historic England			no								Officer summary - No indication as to how the extent of the garden communities will be determined. Concern that the new settlements will be housing led rather than considering the landscape and heritage assets. DPDs for each settlement should be required, through inclusion of an additional criterion in Policy SP9, to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment. Potential for significant archaeological interests in the vicinity of A12 and A120. In addition, there are a number of listed buildings in the area, including Grade I listed buildings at Feering and Little Tey.	Include an additional criterion in Policy SP9, to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment for DPDs in accordance with our advice note 3 Site Allocations in Local Plans in order to assess impact of the proposed allocation upon the historic environment, to inform the appropriate extent of the development and establish any mitigation measures necessary.
7019		Phillip and Pippa Jellard			no								Three vital themes: *Infrastructure, particularly roads and rail *The creation of enough suitable employment opportunities to make the West Tey development sustainable *Economic feasibility of the whole scheme Without suitable employment that residents can travel to, economically qualified buyers are unlikely to live there. This will lead to a preponderance of small, cheap properties occupied largely by unemployed people (and gypsies!). Just like Jaywick. As a brand new development, it will be expensive to deliver. Developers will only make modest financial contributions. The problems are intricate and there is a major risk of a financial car crash. *Officers NB -Unsound	
7051		Boyer Planning			yes						yes		We support policies SP7 and SP9. Our client's land is located within the broad area of search for the Colchester/Braintree Garden Community. It is noted that a Strategic Growth DPD will set out the nature, form and boundary of the new community, and will provide the framework for a more detailed masterplan. As set out in our previous representations, given the proximity to existing residential development and the sustainable location of our client's land, it would be well positioned to form part of the residential provision for the new garden community.	
7061		Mr & Mrs Dumbrells											We would like to say that we are not NIMBYS and understand that houses have to be built, 50 here 50 there, on villages in and around Essex but to dump 24,000 houses (West Tey) is just foolhardy and greed on behalf of those who are planning it.	
7070		John Lindsay											Housing: Low cost housing needed for local people Jobs: No local industry therefore no jobs. All working people will have to commute Railway network : Already at full capacity with only one track in each direction. Schools: New schools will be needed, teacher recruitment already a problem. Doctors: Already difficult to recruit GPs so additional strain on existing services Hospitals: Colchester Hospitals are already struggling Funding: Local authority already under strain to provide adequate services for existing community Roads: Tiptree to A12 B1023 already up to capacity and dangerous for users and local community.	

7071		Mary Lindsay													Housing: Low cost housing needed for local people Jobs: No local industry therefore no jobs. All working people will have to commute Railway network : Already at full capacity with only one track in each direction. Schools: New schools will be needed, teacher recruitment already a problem. Doctors: Already difficult to recruit GPs so additional strain on existing services Hospitals: Colchester Hospitals are already struggling Funding: Local authority already under strain to provide adequate services for existing community Roads: Tiptree to A12 B1023 already up to capacity and dangerous for users and local community.	
7076		Greg Bracken													The proposed West Tey new town development is ill-conceived, disproportionate in scale and wholly unsuitable for a locality already struggling with inadequate infrastructure. The proposed development plan does not address relevant infrastructure issues adequately or at all and would result in considerable impairment to the quality of life of those living in and using the area post-development.	
7094		Department of Education and Skills and Funding	yes	yes	no	*									Policies SP 8, 9 and 10 relate to each of the three proposed Garden Communities. Each policy requires at least one secondary school, primary schools (number and size unspecified) and early-years facilities to be provided to serve new development. The Integrated Delivery Plans for each district provide further details of the number and size of primary and secondary schools required. These details should be included in the above mentioned policies to further demonstrate that the plan has been 'positively prepared' based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed infrastructure requirements.	Include the details referenced in the IDP regarding the number and size of primary and secondary schools required for the new garden community development in Policy itself.
7096		Philip Limmack													The A120 is permanently gridlocked, trains stations have no parking or increased traveller capacity. Hospitals/ dentists have extended waiting lists. Already 50,000 new homes built or planned within a twenty mile area. Proposal will generate in excess of 500,00 additional car journeys/week. There are no local jobs therefore people will have to commute.	
7097		Anthony Hicks			no										West Tey is not the correct location for this so called project.Unclear how housing numbers 23,660 calculated. The A12 & A120 already congested. Development will generate 36,000 additional cars with increase in traffic accidents, health issues , air and noise pollution. No plans to extend current transport systems until 2030. Marks Tey train station difficult to access and trains at capacity- No measures to meet needs of 56,000 potential new users. Why is infrastructure not being provided first? Destruction of 3,200 acres of countryside Pressure on local schools.Too much risk /uncertainty about infrastructure upgrades & costs .	
7098		Diana Flack			no										I cannot believe that the proposed development at 'West Tey' is considered remotely viable.Local schools are full, the A12 is gridlocked and the A120 is groaning under the volume of traffic currently using it.Trains on the Norwich/Colchester to London line are bursting. London Road Copford is used by commuters as a free car park with negative impact on local people.Development on such a vast scale will destroy the character of the area, swallowing up the villages between Braintree and Colchester. Loss of quality of life for existing residents. I urge you to reconsider the proposal.	I urge you to reconsider the proposal.
7101		HBF			no					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	H				In SP7 the target of 30% is clearly set out in part v. However, in Policy SP8 and Policy SP9 these targets are set out as minimums.An essential part of the local plan is to provide certainty to the applicants and to decision makers with regard to new development. Placing a minimum on the affordable housing requirement suggests that a higher proportion may be applicable and is purely a starting point for negotiation. To make these policies sound the affordable housing requirement in SP8, SP9 and SP10 should not be set as minimums.	Affordable housing requirements shouldn't be set as minimums.
7103		Gail Turner Mooney													The West Tey plan for nearly 24,000 new homes is not workable. Local petitions have been ignored. It is an ill thought out scheme with no notice taken of local often informed views. Inadequate consideration by Councillors about infrastructure - A120, A12 and rail line are already under huge pressure. Insufficient drainage schemes, schools, shops, doctors, planned for West Tey. Tending is more suitable for growth. No need for a vast commuter town (where are the jobs?) in this part of North Essex. Nor is there a need for the proposed development of Marks Wood near Pattiswick.	
7105		Robin Bartleet			no							h			I am very concerned at the apparent contravention of the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 112 in the selection of the site of the Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community. The published 'Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales' (1969) survey shows this area to be predominantly grade 2 agricultural land. This should be retained in productive agriculture and not developed for other uses.The Framework is clear in this regard and it is being ignored by the proposal.	None

7120		G120, Cirrus and L&Q (Iceni Projects, David Churchill)								h	yes	We support the production of a new Local Plan in principle and have worked closely with the Councils to date in the delivery of the Local Plan. In particular we support the Section 1 Plan, with particular regard to policies SP7 & SP9. We feel there are a number of areas the Councils need to strengthen their evidence base to ensure a sound and legally compliant Local Plan is demonstrated. We are happy to continue working with the Councils in delivering this.	Whilst we feel the principle of the Local Plan to date has been sound and legally compliant, there are a number of areas detailed within the representations where further evidence is required. We will continue to work with the Councils to ensure this evidence is delivered.
7132		Leonard Watson										Future growth should be contained within current town envelopes and respect the rural character around Marks Tey The A12 and A120 at Marks Tey are overburdened. A new bypass from Braintree, around the West Tey is essential. Rail capacity and the inadequate parking at Marks Tey Train Station must be addressed. Future development proposals must include a clean energy infrastructure plan, a new communication exchange delivering high-speed internet and a fully developed economic plan. A prefunded commitment to build both primary and secondary schools and health facilities must be agreed. Concern over the ability to deliver West Tey on budget.	
7135		Les Rampton			no							1 The a12 is already an over used road and struggles to accommodate the over use it already has.2 The A120 struggles with the flow of traffic and often backs up to Coggeshall.3 The schools could not handle the amount of new pupils that West Tey would bring.4 There would have to be another police force and hospital to cope with the amount of new development this would bring to this area that we struggle to budget for already. I do not consider this new development to be a good idea and totally disagree with the idea.	
7146		Sport England (Taylor)									yes	Principle 16 is welcomed as it provides the policy basis for ensuring that provision is made for green infrastructure (including outdoor sports facilities), to provides opportunities for new residents to be active. This is a key part of the infrastructure of the development. Principle 17 is also welcomed as it makes provision for the provision of indoor leisure and sports facilities within the new community or off-site. The outdoor and indoor sports facilities strategies prepared or under development as part of the Local Plan evidence base should be used for inform how the development makes provision for indoor/outdoor sport.	
7164		Gladman Development (Mathieu Evans)	yes	yes	no				✓	h	yes	Gladman consider that the garden community on the boundary of Colchester and Tendring will not deliver units as quickly as the council expect and therefore further smaller scale housing sites will be required to be allocated to deliver in the short term. Site specific information on the delivery of all of the garden communities is included in appendix 3 of this representation.	Reduce by 1,100 dwellings
7181		Tim Orchard										1) There simply isn't enough infrastructure to cope with almost 24,000 new houses. Above all, no extra public transport is envisaged for many years 2) Train services to London from Marks Tey are already full at peak hours; and it is unlikely that Greater Anglia can or will increase capacity. In any case, access to the station is already tricky; and the car parks are already full every day. 3) West Tey (like Marks Tey) would be divided by the A120, which is a crazy way to arrange any town. 4) West Tey would be neither sustainable nor affordable.	None
7182		Sarah Brown										It should not even be considered at present due the the existing shortfalls of the current infrastructure and uncertainty surrounding Brexit. Also, the existing residents enjoy a semi-rural part of Essex and have chosen to live here for the pleasant nature of the area. South Essex, in contrast is already covered in concrete, we chose to live here as it has fields, farms and country side. By imposing a town the size of West Tey on this area you are completely changing the aesthetics and dynamics which are totally unfair and unacceptable to the existing population.	None
7183		Simon Crees										A huge development will simply render the area impossible to live and work in due to constant overcrowding resulting in many people looking to move away. It's my view that the authorities should be prepared to push for large scale developments to be dispersed more evenly throughout the UK , rather than constantly looking at the already overcrowded areas of South East England. There are areas of the UK that are crying out for investment and development to bring new people into those areas which would in turn create the conditions for new businesses and jobs to be created.	None

7188		Great Tey Parish Council (David Williams)	yes	yes	no								Additional area housing is required but not West Tey where road, rail and health infrastructure are at capacity.. Not the most appropriate land for this development considering National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 112 Great Tey would lose its identity. This development will affect the area for many years with construction and increased traffic on the local roads. Without major improvements to A120,A12 with a bypass at Marks Tey, only 500 to 900 new dwellings could be built, and would not establish a garden community. Colchester hospital and local doctors' surgeries are at capacity,not supporting West Tey. Great Tey Parish Council	The change is to withdraw the proposed development of West Tey Garden Village completely.
7196		Mr Roger Pitt			no	✓				w			Services for North Essex are inadequate for present need. Whether rail, roads, hospitals or schools. These matters should be addressed before such a development is envisaged and must be put in place first and not left to the whim of the developer. The proposed work on the A12 and A120 will only upgrade them as trunk routes,(ie junctions must not be too close together)	Enlargement of existing communities not imposing a new town the size of Braintree on the area. first improve local public road transport and in the long term rail and rapid transport.
7202		Jennifer Panting			no								I wish to object to the proposed development. I feel that a rural area would not be able to cope with that size increase. There is no provision for the increase in population being catered for. Our local schools, roads, and health care services will be under a massive strain. How can a small Station like Marks Tey cope it's unsustainable. There really is little that can be done to meet the increases in capacity. The A12 is already congested. Along with narrow country roads it really is poorly planned.	
7203		Jennifer Panting			no								I wish to object to the proposed development. I feel that a rural area would not be able to cope with that size increase. There is no provision for the increase in population being catered for. Our local schools, roads, and health care services will be under a massive strain. How can a small Station like Marks Tey cope it's unsustainable. There really is little that can be done to meet the increases in capacity. The A12 is already congested. Along with narrow country roads it really is poorly planned.	
7205		Mrs Julie Hammond			no								Both my husband and I both object to the above New Town being built due to the infrastructure around this area. The A120 and A12 are both extremely congested and it will only get worse. No expansion of the trains and/or station to be extended. Also our village lives will be massively interrupted. There are plenty of areas nearer Towns and Cities that can be looked at, not at our beautiful countryside.Please take this as notice of our desire to respond against the new Town of 23,660 homes being built.	
7206		Stuart & Rebecca Newton			no								Please take this email as confirmation of my objection to the above named development. I believe that this potential development is not feasible as the local infrastructure cannot cope with the scale of this proposal. In addition, the impact to the local environment based upon the number of houses proposed in my view is unjustified. Whilst I appreciate the need to solve the current lack of housing problem in this part of the UK, I do not in any way think that a development of this size in this part of Essex should be part of the solution.	
7209		Roy Sefton			no								West Tey would be bad for the whole North Essex area. Trains, roads, schools and Healthcare would not cope. West Tey would not be sustainable or affordable. It is the wrong place for a new town. West Tey would be served by two trunk roads already proven to be highly polluting with dangerously poor air quality, I take long walks with my dogs and moved here for the country air etc. I can't be expected to walk or cycle to Colchester and Braintree and yet no external public transport is planned before a park+ride in 2030 that's 13 years!	
7216		Jane Bedford			no	x	x	x	x		yes		Our Objection to the proposed garden communities are because of :- Inadequate infrastructure - including pressure on water supplies, waste disposal, medical facilities and emergency services, roads and transport. Loss of Greenfield sites - particularly agricultural land Need to utilise existing Brownfield / non greenfield sites for smaller developments prioritising affordable housing.	
7219		Mary Schoeser											The proposed West Tey development will destroy the character of the historic town of Coggeshall, will increase pressure on the A120 that is unlikely to be resolved for more than a decade or more, and is ill-conceived in relation to infrastructure and the impact of years of disruptive development that will not produce a well-integrated garden village	
7221		Mr T Pailthorpe			no						yes		I reply to your letter of 18th June 2017. I strongly oppose the concept of a "garden community" at West Tey. It is not a suitable location, lacks infrastructure and sustainability. It would also over power neighbouring settlements, hardly an	



													enhancement.This needs to be seriously rethought through and a much more practical, people friendly and self contained solution applied.
7222		Mr Peter Treymayne			no						yes		Officers interpretation: - coalescence of Chelmsford through to Colchester- other sites should be further scoped-light pollution -loss of agricultural land-infrastructure will be compromised further-CIL and section 106 will be too high to be achievable-will social housing be viable? -costs could rise -poor air quality-duration of build time is unacceptable-existing marks tey station can not cope with more users-
7289		Charlotte Hicks			no								opposed to West Tey development. Surrounding roads already congested. Development would lead to increased levels of air and noise pollution. Lack of public transport. Infrastructure should come first, but they can't afford to put this in place. Disruption to wildlife and quiet footpaths. Marks Tey station already difficult to access. Pressure on schools immense. Cost estimates are 50% too low with only 5% contingency.
7366		Peter Curtis									h		I write to express my strong opposition to the proposal to build some 23,000 houses in the area known as West Tey, to the east of Colchester. Particular concern expressed regarding the inadequacy (existing) of the infrastructure including roads, rail, hospitals and Doctors. Also consider that development should not result in the loss of high quality agricultural land, as the country is not able meet its own food production needs. Any houses needed should be built on low value land or brownfield site.
7442		Mr S Austin											I cannot see it is necessary to build new houses in this area as surely there is scope to expand on the outside of large towns like Colchester Witham Braintree and Chelmsford. I know my neighbours are alarmed at the prospect of a new town surrounding what is a quiet village at present. Besides the extra traffic will create more pollution in the countryside of the Great Tey area and spoil the environment of surrounding villages such as Coggeshall and Feering so therefore I am most concerned about the thousand of new houses proposed
7468		Leonie Alpin, Maldon District Council			no						✓		It is insufficient to allocate 7,500 homes to these Garden Communities in this plan period, based on an indicative area alone. To provide more certainty, these areas should be defined more clearly on the Local Plan policies maps. The employment allocation for the Garden Community should be explicitly stated in this policy alongside the housing allocations. The impact of a 24,000 home development at Marks Tey, on leisure and recreational facilities and infrastructure in adjoining districts needs to be calculated and planned for. The roads infrastructure, including any A12 junction improvements must be designed to accommodate the traffic.
7482		Lynn Keeble											object to the proposal of West Tey. The development will be sustainable without first creating infrastructure that will be able to cope. The A120 is already heavily congested on a normal day Both Marks Tey and Kelvedon railway stations cannot cope with existing footfall without adding another 23,660 households. Existing households already find it hard to obtain GP appointments due to the pressure on our local surgeries, and as for navigating our local roads its often quicker to walk rather than drive, something that my parents are no longer able to do either of.



16		Mr Wal Andrews	No	No	No					No		1. Summary There seems to be a lack of overall leadership and responsibility when considering the cumulative impact on local infrastructure, environment and actual needs of each individual neighbourhood plan and new towns proposed within the East Anglia region. It seems to me to be adding up to a total disaster at so many levels all of which can be avoided and solve most of our housing shortage with a more considered long term and joined up approach to planning. There should be named individuals with better central and local responsibility for taking an overview of the real and genuine concerns and objections of local residents.	Not known. I do not understand the first part of this form and certainly have no wish to comment on each individual section. My comments as above refer to the whole poorly thought through new housing plans both here and across the whole of the East Anglia region and not just odd bits of it. Fragmenting comment does, in my opinion, dilute the genuine reasons why these housing plans are so poor and all add up to a cumulative environmental disaster for all living in this region should they be adopted. Is this deliberate?
40		Ms Sue Dobson Bridleways Development Officer Essex Bridleways Association	Yes	Yes	No	ü	ü	ü	ü	Yes		Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community: PointD Transportation states in paragraph 7 that the provision of a network of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways to enhance permeability within the site will be provided, and this is excellent news. However, it is unfortunate that this requirement does not continue through to paragraph 10 where it states that Foot and cycle ways shall be provided throughout the development We suggest that for this Plan to be considered sound, access should be accessible for ALL users, including equestrians. This will ensure that the Plan can be fully inclusive and not discriminate against one user sector, also that the Authorities Policies can be consistent throughout the Plan. PointE Community Infrastructure paragraph 16 refers to multi-functional green infrastructure; for the Plan to be considered sound, we suggest that the list of facilities include areas for informal recreation accessible to all users, ensuring consistency throughout the Plan.	Amend this Policy with those changes detailed above to incorporate equestrian access.
56		Sport England Sport England Planning Manager Eastern Region Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes					No		O/S - Principle 16 is welcomed, as it provides the basis for green infrastructure. Principle 17 is welcomed as it makes provision for indoor leisure and sports.	
85		Mr Norman Jennings	Yes	Yes	No		ü			No		General comment Again destruction of ancient local villages. Loss of large areas of prime agricultural land. Positive aspects, close to A12 and main line stations, potential A120 dualing between Braintree and Marks Tey. Close to Colchester and employment.	
94		Mrs Anna Tame Clerk Crossing PC	Yes	Yes	No	ü	ü			No		Cressing Parish Council object to the proposal for West Tey to have a maximum housing allocation of 24,000. West Tey should be the same size as the other two i.e. up to 10,000 houses at the very most. The councils do not need to allocate such a large garden community since they can easily satisfy their housing numbers with 3 garden communities of up to 10,000 houses. The traffic generation implications of the proposed new towns along the A120 corridor (old and potential new road) is a matter of great concern. Colchester/Braintree Boarders Garden Community - 'Boarders' should be 'Borders'	
101		Mr & Mrs Andrew Adair	No	No	No	ü	ü	ü		Yes		The new towns should be cancelled due to loss of countryside, loss of biodiversity, corrupt land procurement system, Council's conflict of interest, possibility of emolument, planning blight and conflict of interest in use of compulsory purchase. Legislation should be introduced to compel developers to build on existing brownfield sites before considering greenfield.	The removal of the New Town proposals for West & East Braintree. The introduction of legislation to compel developers/builders to build on existing brownfield sites with housing before any greenfield projects are even considered by Council Planning Committees. No further mis-use of public funds spent on promoting New Town building in North East Essex. A greater commitment by Local Councils to require builders to increase the amount of social housing on each brownfield site developed.

118		Mrs Dawn Marriot Clerk Messing Cum Inworth Parish Council	Yes	Yes	No	ü	ü	ü	Yes		The entire plan relies on the Essex County Council A120 route consultation adopting option B or C, so that the necessary housing can be delivered on the Braintree Colchester border " new garden community. Other, more suitable, Brownfield sites are available. How will this plan be delivered if that garden community does not go ahead? What economic justification is there for this community? How can the area of site just increase since the original plans to encompass several small villages without consultation? Mention is made of a new slip road off the A12 to help service traffic from Tiptree and surrounding villages, but no detail are given. In order to be sound this plan needs to be positively prepared, justified and effective, in our view it has not achieved this, just left many thousands of residents uncertain as to what may happen to their home, their village and their lives over the next 25 years.	detailed plans regarding the site location for the proposed Garden community need to be laid out " at present the number of properties/villages affected is too large- answers such as it is the area of site and there will be green areas at the edge of the site are insufficient . this has changed since the last phase of the consultation. There must be clear definition and separation of villages. Regarding the potential slip road for traffic from the Tiptree area to /from the A12- either need to be presented on a plan or a separate consultation to justify the location, this plan cannot be signed off with such vague plans.
125		Mr Kevin Fraser Principal Planner, Spatial Planning Team Essex County Council Spatial Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes			ü	No		The change refers to the transport network rather than merely the road network. `Longer term transport interventions will need to be carefully designed to minimise the impacts on the strategic and local transport road network and fully mitigate any environmental or traffic impacts arising from the development. These shall include bus (or other public transit provisions) priority measures between the site, University of Essex, Hythe station and Colchester Town Centre;	
145		Mr & Mrs Mark & Wanda Smith	Yes	Yes	No		ü	ü	No		We are against the proposed inclusion in the Draft Local Plan of development at West Tey as there is a lack of supporting infrastructure and the existing road and train network would be unable to cope with the volume of traffic and commuters on an already overburdened route. Lack of facilities i.e schools, healthcare. Incoherent urban sprawl, not sustainable or affordable and will become a commuter town severed by two trunk roads. Loss of open countryside, irretrievable. High levels of pollution and poor air quality. No provision for cycleways, public transport. Marks Tey station is difficult to access and trains are already full. Difficulties in providing jobs at West Tey. The number of homes planned would generate 23,660 houses and 56,000 people. About 36,000 extra cars? Too much risk and uncertainty about infrastructure upgrades.	
147		Mrs Nicola Joshua	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered	ü	ü	ü	No		The extent of the purple shaded area for the East Braintree/West Colchester garden settlement requirements a definitive boundary.	defined the extent of the new Garden Settlements
160		Ms Alex Stevenson	Yes	Yes	No		ü	ü	No	4686798	SP 9 Contradiction between the text and map 10.3 B	The plan should include in its figures and maps the green buffer between existing settlements and proposed new settlements . Then reduce accordingly the area of purple shading which could be interpreted in the future as the extent of the garden towns. If this does not happen the plan will be unsound because there is a contradiction between the text and the maps which could be exploited in the future by developers councils who want to extend the envelope of existing or new settlement.

178		Mrs S Osborne	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	ü	ü	No		Why I object to West Tey..... Poor community engagement Lack of detailed map of area affected. lack of detail of how the plan will be realised lack of infrastructure. Presently surrounding road , rail full to capacity . wrong place lack of consideration for neighbouring villages poor inherent historical infrastructure. With limited capacity to increase. loss of wildlife, threat to endangered species. Loss of nightskies ...i.e. Light pollution only 5% financial contingency planning when uplift of 40% more likely negative effect on community well being due to urbanisation of the area. negative impact on health due to high levels of pollution in the area lack of resilience in the health care provision and community providers ...already overstretched with GP recruitment crisis potential increasing crime rates and deprivation Lack of realisation of affordable housing. Too much public money has been wasted on this project already ran out of time to fill this in see earlier!	I object to West tey . Wrong place. Colchester has become too overdeveloped without keeping up with transport planning and infrastructure delivery. New home bonuses should be spent on protecting rural bus services so communities are less reliant on cars. Investment in local footpaths and bridleways. Colchester borough council are not following it's own air policy pollution recommendations. Both Colchester and Braintree becoming hot spots of air pollution....with roads at full capacity and new delivery schemes not realised. Braintree district council needs to have a rethink in it's delivery of housing numbers rather than an oversimplistic 'build next to A roads. Garden cities are meant to be self reliant there is little evidence that this will be the case in reality....instead it will become a dormitory town destroying this area of Essex it's the wildlife habitats Colchester needs to be recognised for the significant housing development that has taken place already An area of green zone /belt should be designated around Colchester with immediate effect to prevent this sprawl all along the A12 due to lack of imaginative planning.. Just because there a A road there doesn't mean it offers all the solutions,
182		Ms Jennifer Stevenson	Yes	Yes	No		ü		ü	No		The green buffer between West Tey should be marked on the maps so we know where it is going and protect the villages and towns that are already here.	The plan should show a green buffer on the maps between existing villages and West Tey and the numbers of houses reduced on Cogg174 and the Essex Way next to it protected and kept green and open
191		Mrs Sarah Holt	Yes	Yes	Yes				ü	No		Map 10.3B in part 1 of the draft plan shows that the boundary of the West Tey Garden Village extends to the junction of Colchester Road with the A120. The text says that there will be a green buffer between Coggeshall parish and West Tey, which we support, but the map contradicts the text. By maintaining all of this field (between Tey Road, Mount Road, Hill Road, Colchester Road, A120) it will prevent housing development from spoiling the character, look and pleasure people gain from walking the Essex Way - as this section of the path stretches from the A120 directly into Coggeshall through the agricultural field - currently growing corn.	Please maintain all of the above field as a green buffer before it becomes a legal document, so that in the future it will prevent development being extended into the parish of Coggeshall. Thus, preventing mass urban sprawl with no fields separating Coggeshall from West Tey.
203		Mr Daniel Worth	Yes	Yes	No	ü	ü			No		Object to West Tey Garden Community " The A120 is unable to accommodate more traffic " no building of homes until this is complete. Hospitals are not able to cope with an additional 24,000 houses " e.g. blood tests are undertaken in Ipswich. Colchester Hospital is graded inadequate. Rail networks require investment however it is unfair to relocate Marks Tey Station.	
210		Henry Price	No	No	No	ü	ü	ü	ü	Yes		Unsound: no justification for the siting nor proper consideration of better sites or brownfield Unsustainable on many grounds: - transport, lack of critical mass to support necessary facilities Not legally compliant with NPPF on many criteria: sustainability, biodiversity Failure of duty to co-operate with local villages or with UDC	As stated I cannot see that WoB can ever be legal under NPPF, or soundly justified on endless grounds. The policy needs replacing with an alternative site - preferably to expand and make successful Braintree and Witham, which are currently miserable and failing communities.

215		Mr Peter Williams Director Williams Group Agent: Mrs Teresa Cook Principal Consultant Emery Planning Partnership Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	ü	ü	ü	ü	Yes		This location is no more than a strategic area for development. It is expected to deliver 2,500 homes in total over the plan period, with 1,150 identified within Braintree District (from Policy LPP17). We have noted in our response to Policy SP3 that the delivery of housing from these sites is likely to be delayed and reduced in comparison to the assumptions set out in the housing trajectory. The ability of the proposed garden community to perform an effective role in the spatial strategy (being locationally less of a priority than expanding the largest centres) and in the delivery of the significant need for housing is over-optimistic. It also means that there is an over-reliance on the inclusion of retail and employment in this location.	The number of homes stated to be delivered at the Colchester/Braintree borders Garden Community site should be reduced in line with the review of delivery rates as described in our response to Policy SP2.
233		Mr Stuart McAdam	Yes	Yes	No		ü	ü	ü	Yes		Persimmon Homes strongly suggest Braintree is at risk of not being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply during in the course of the plan period and the delivery of sufficient housing within the overall Plan period. The Draft Local Plan does not: -adequately consider increased migration from London - impact of London not meeting its own housing need - Effectively assess key market signals In order to future proof the plan, it is suggested that the Council should seek to allocate reserved sites which can be brought forward if Braintree see an increase in their housing needs	It is considered that an uncapped target does not provide certainty and could place a policy burden that would threaten viability. The market and purchasing decisions factor in policy requirements and not having clarity would give rise to significant uncertainty that would not assist delivery.
235		Mr Tim Pailthorpe Committee member (planning) - responses through Chairman Kelvedon & feering Heritage Society	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes		O/S - Garden Community - Premature, await infrastructure. Colchester - Consider neighbours when taking decisions.	Garden Community - Premature, await infrastructure. Colchester - Consider neighbours when taking decisions.
248		Environment Agency Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No				ü	No		O/S - Item 18 should be re-worded along the following lines:  'Provision of improvements, ahead of development, to waste water treatment including an upgrade to the Colchester Waste Water Treatment Plan in accordance with the programme set out in the Braintree Infrastructure Delivery Plan and off-site drainage improvements'.	Item 18 should be re-worded along the following lines: Provision of improvements, ahead of development, to waste water treatment including an upgrade to the Colchester Waste Water Treatment Plan in accordance with the programme set out in the Braintree Infrastructure Delivery Plan and off-site drainage improvements. The purpose here is to set out a clear signposting of infrastructure delivery requirements as evaluated under the BIDP. It should be noted that the priority for this infrastructure type is described as critical under Table 13.1, which is presumably a reflection of its importance.
297		Choice Construction Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		ü	ü		Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
298		Barkley Projects Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		ü	ü		Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.

299		Mr Watson-Steele Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
300		Mr Gavin Day DSG Developments Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
301		Mr D P Nott Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
302		Granville Developments Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
303		Mr Lightly Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
304		Mrs D Golding Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
305		Mr W Kerry Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
306		Pertwee Estates Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
307		Mr G Williamson Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.

308		Mrs J Scarlett Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü		Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
309		Mrs J Sawyer Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü		Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
310		Mr C Coghlan Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü		Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
311		Mr R Carter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü		Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
312		Mr M Harrington Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü		Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
313		Mr Martin Cowan Poplar Nurseries Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	ü	ü	Yes	This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
314		Mr M Spurgeon Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü		Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
315		Mr D Clough Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü		Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
316		Mr & Mrs Harrison Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü		Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.



317		The Shepherd Trust Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
318		Mr C Reid Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
319		Mr D White Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
320		Mssrs Parmenter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
321		Mrs D Morrall Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
322		Mr C Hart Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
323		Mr M Allard Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No	ü	ü	Yes		This Garden Community can only come to fruition subject to huge levels of investment and is premature pending decisions relating to the A120. The environmental impacts are unacceptable in terms of the harm to the countryside and coalescence of settlements.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community. Refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long-term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity elsewhere.
378		Ms Debbie Morgan Clerk Coggeshall Parish Council	Yes	Yes	No	ü		No		CNP and CPC submit that these maps should be amended to clarify the built envelope. BDC and ECC should establish in the preliminary planning phase (now, before the publication of the Local Plan), a significant green buffer between existing communities and the new garden communities to ensure coalescence between new and old settlements will not take place after the lifetime of this plan. In addition, we submit that to support the maps a minimum distance should be added into the text of the Local Plan to ensure that there is no confusion. Section 6.18 (pp31) Bus, Walking and Cycling CNP and CPC support the aim to connect settlements with Cycle and Bridle way , Page 39, Protect the amenity of existing and future residents with regard to noise, vibration, smell, loss of light and overlooking. As a comment CNP would support this aim especially with regard to development of the road networks, recognising that this is outside the scope of the BDC plan.	
415		Mr Peter Kohn Chariman Coggeshall Neighbourhood Plan Committee	Yes	Yes	No	ü		No		CNP and CPC submit that these maps should be amended to clarify the built envelope. BDC and ECC should establish in the preliminary planning phase (now, before the publication of the Local Plan), a significant green buffer between existing communities and the new garden communities to ensure coalescence between new and old settlements will not take place after the lifetime of this plan. In addition, we submit that to support the maps a minimum distance should be added into the text of the Local Plan to ensure that there is no confusion. Section 6.18 (pp31) Bus, Walking and Cycling CNP and CPC support the aim to connect settlements with Cycle and Bridle ways , Page 39, Protect the amenity of existing and future residents with regard to noise, vibration, smell, loss of light and overlooking. As a	

												comment CNP would support this aim especially with regard to development of the road networks, recognising that this is outside the scope of the BDC plan.	
	426		Mr Toby Buscombe	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					No	Add Green Buffer to Garden Village Maps	
	507		Andrewsfield New Settlement Consortium Agent: Mr David Maxwell GL Hearn	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Officer's summary: Andrewsfield New Settlement Consortium (ANSC) recognises the importance of the delivery of the two other garden communities, to ensure the timely provision of new homes, employment opportunities, community and leisure facilities and infrastructure throughout the Plan period, and beyond.	
	522		Gateway 120 Ltd Agent: Mr David Churchill ICENI Projects	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Yes	We support the production of a new Local Plan in principle and have worked closely with the Councils to date in the delivery of the Local Plan. In particular we support the Section 1 Plan, with particular regard to Policies SP7 and SP9. We feel there are a number of areas the Councils need to strengthen their evidence base to ensure a sound and legally compliant Local Plan is demonstrated. We are happy to continue working with the Councils in delivering this.	Whilst we feel the principle of the Local Plan to date has been sound and legally compliant, there are a number of areas detailed within the representations where further evidence is required. We will continue to work with the Councils to ensure this evidence is delivered.
	530		Consultation Service Natural England	Yes	Yes	No					Yes	UNSOUND (Legal Compliance and Not Consistent with the NPPF). We acknowledge that protection and enhancement of Marks Tey Brickpit SSSI is now included in Policy SP 9 Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community at point F.21, as per our previous advice on Policy SP4 (now PS5) Infrastructure and Connectivity. Regarding the dualling of the A120, we note at paragraph 6.10 of Section 1 that a preferred route option will be supplied in Autumn 2017. Please also see our comments in Other Advice below on the Strategic Growth DPD, and our advice on paragraph 8.5 regarding policy commitment to a RAMS.	
	550		Mr Phil Bamford Planning Manager Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	ü	ü	ü	ü	Yes	Officer's summary: Gladman consider that the Garden Communities will not deliver units as quickly as the Council expect and therefore further smaller scale housing sites will be required to be allocated to deliver in the short term.	
	555		Ms Katie Brown Network Rail	Yes	Question not answered	Yes					No	Officer's summary: It is encouraging that there is support for improved accessibility and possible relocation of Marks Tey Station. Network Rail is currently working on a separate response in relation to Garden Communities to Braintree, Colchester and Tendring District Councils, which we hope to share with you in the near future.	
	589		Mr Oliver Marigold Principle Planner Tetlow King Planning	Yes	Yes	No				ü	No	We consider that a number of amendments are necessary to the Publication Draft Local Plan, to ensure that the full opportunity of a rent to buy model is included within the definition of affordable housing.	See above

591		Mrs Cathryn Carlisle Clerk Great Saling Parish Council	No	No	No	ü	ü		ü	Question not answered		In summary, we feel that the WoB plan is ill thought out and the almost total opposition from residents both here and in the surrounding villages should be given serious consideration by the Planning Inspectorate.	
592		Mr Neville Bridgman	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Question not answered		Officer's summary: My wife and I strongly oppose the West Tey proposal, it feels like a done deal. The county is over-populated and infrastructure is creaking under the strain. When the proposal for West Tey is taken alongside other planned building in Witham, Kelvedon, Feering, Marks Tey and Colchester it feels as if north Essex is being concreted over, destroying the rural nature of the area.	
593		Mr G J Charnley	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Question not answered		Officer's Summary: Local infrastructure cannot cope, particularly roads, medical care and education.	
594		Mr Simon Crees	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Question not answered		Officer's summary: Oppose West Tey, public services are over capacity particularly medical care, public transport and roads. The authorities should be prepared to push for large scale developments to be dispersed more evenly throughout the UK, rather than constantly looking at the already overcrowded areas of South East England.	
596		Ms Clare Bramwell	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Question not answered		Officer's summary: Braintree District Council must amend the map to clearly define a green buffer between Coggleshall and West Tey.	
600		Mrs Carol Richards Diocese of Chelmsford	Question not answered	Question not answered	No					Question not answered		Officer's summary: For Policy SP9 to be sound œplaces of worship• needs to be included in the list of community services and facilities. See MPPF para 70.	For Policy SP9 to be sound œplaces of worship• needs to be included in the list of community services and facilities. Since the NPPF specifically mentions œplaces of worship• this policy SP9 should also specifically mention œplaces of worship• as it cannot be assumed that œplaces of worship• are included if they are not mentioned. The most appropriate place to add this information is point 13 œCommunity meeting places will be provided within the district and local centres including places of worship• .
609		Cllr James Abbott Silver End & Cressing Ward	No	No	No	ü	ü	ü	ü	Yes		Delete West Tey from the plan or reduce the allocation to that required in the plan period (7,500)	Delete West Tey from the plan or reduce it to the required allocation for that site in the plan period of 2,500 homes.

612		Mr James Stevens Home Builders Federation	Yes	Yes	No				ü	Yes	Officer's summary: In SP7 the absolute target for affordable housing of 30% is clearly set out in part v. However, in Policy SP8 and Policy SP9 these targets are set out as minimums. To make these policies sound the affordable housing requirement in SP8, SP9 and SP10 should not be set as minimums.	Based on both increased migration from London and concerns regarding affordability we would suggest the following OANs for each of the three Councils forming part of the North Essex area: Braintree " 762 dpa (623 starting point plus 12 units for London migration scenario and a 20% uplift) Colchester " 1002 dpa (866 starting point plus 45 units for London migration scenario and a 10% uplift) Tendring " 776 dpa (675 plus 15% uplift) This level of delivery would require the North Essex HMA to deliver 2540 homes per annum, a total of 50,800 new homes between 2013 and 2033.
615		Mr Peter Farmer	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Question not answered	Officer's comments: The decision to site it around roads that have not yet been agreed in planning terms let alone having a construction timetable is appalling. Before any bricks for houses are laid, the myriad of current problems with the infrastructure of this region must be addressed. Roads, trains, hospitals, schools, telephone systems, broadband, gas and electricity services, sewerage, water and refuse collection are at breaking point.	
616		Mr Brian Edmunds	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Question not answered	Officer's comments: West Tey is a bad idea. Until the A12 and the A120 are fit for purpose and until the rail link to Liverpool Street including access to LiverpoolSt Station are significantly improved a major development in this area will be out of place.	
618		C S Bright	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Question not answered	Officer's comments: Oppose Marks Tey expansion, housing will not be affordable and will be purchased by commuters. Local people have to move out to Suffolk, stop building executive homes. Agriculture should be used for food, traffic will be intolerable. We do not need a local plan but a National Plan to put Industry and housing in parts of the country where it is really needed. Proposals will lead to the destruction of Essex as we know it with many of the towns and villages merging into one another as has happened along the A12 and around Colchester and Chelmsford.	
620		Mr & Mrs Philip Jellard	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Question not answered	I submit below some short comments on why I consider the Local Plan SP9 is not sound a) the trains will not manage with the commuters living in the 23,000 houses b) the road infrastructure is wholly inadequate and the A120 dualling between Braintree and the A12 needs to be operational before any houses are built c) the area would destroy important Grade 2 agricultural land	
621		Mr James Hannan Chairman North Essex Astronomical Society	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Question not answered	we have a membership of over 120 people who enjoy observing and using our facilities at the Observatory. We have beautiful views of the southern skies and a good view of the horizon. Unfortunately this is in the direction of Marks Tey, we understand the need for the development and are not here to dispute it. However, we implore you to make low level lighting a necessity in the new development, this would greatly reduce the light pollution and allow us to continue using our site, that brings joy to so many. We are aware of many new developments where they use low level lighting, or focused lighting, which helps to reduce light pollution. As well as having the added benefit of reducing light pollution into our night sky for stargazers, it will also benefit local wildlife that can find night time lights very disruptive.	

	628		Mr J Lyons	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered				Question not answered		O/S - Opposed to Marks Tey, this green belt offers invaluable quality of life to many thousands of residents in adjacent villages. Environmental destruction from car pollutants. The local infrastructure will experience serious issues with services such as schooling, surgeries, buses, Internet connectivity, sewage, water pressure, traffic congestion and an increase in crime.	
	632		Mr Douglas McNab Forward Planning Manager - South East Education and Skills Funding Agency Department For Education	Yes	Yes	Yes				No		The ESFA also welcomes the focus in policy SP7 on the sequencing of development and infrastructure provision to ensure that the latter is provided ahead of or in tandem with the development it supports. Policies SP 8, 9 and 10 relate to each of the three proposed Garden Communities. Each policy requires at least one secondary school, primary schools (number and size unspecified) and early-years facilities to be provided to serve new development. The Integrated Delivery Plans for each district provide further details of the number and size of primary and secondary schools required. These details should be included in the above mentioned policies to further demonstrate that the plan has been positively prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed infrastructure requirements.	The Councils are working with ECC as the local education authority on this and it will be developed through the DPDs
	634		Ms Gail Mooney	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered				Question not answered		O/S - Once again I repeat what I have already written to some, if not to all of you – the West Tey plan for nearly 24,000 new homes is not workable. Local petitions have been ignored. It is a thoroughly ill thought out scheme which is taking no notice of local – often informed – views.  There are far better areas in Tendring	
	635		Deborah Page	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered				Question not answered		Officer's summary: Regarding the development of Cook's field, this busy junction linking Colne Road, St Peter's Road and Coggeshall Road is often referred to as a rat run between Earls Colne and Kelvedon. I can only see that the congestion particularly at school times and rush hour would be worsened by a significant housing development at this point. As a daily walker of this stretch of the Essex Way with my dog, I would find it extremely disappointing if our precious green spaces are reduced even more to build housing.	
	647		Dr Natalie Gates Principal Advisor, Historic Places Team Historic England	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered				Question not answered		Officer's Summary: Additional criterion in Policy SP9, to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment in accordance with our advice note 3. See our comments regarding HIA for Garden Communities above.  The area identified for the garden community includes the A120, a Roman road known as Stane Street and the A12, also a Roman road. As a consequence, there is the potential for significant archaeological interests in the vicinity of these roads. In addition, there are a number of listed buildings in the area, including Grade I listed buildings at Feering and Little Tey.	
	650		NHS Mid Essex CCG NHS Mid Essex Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered				Yes		Please amend policy SP8, SP9, SP10, section E. Community Infrastructure, point 13 "to read increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities.	Please amend policy SP8, SP9, SP10, section E. Community Infrastructure, point 13 "to read increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities.
	653		NHS Property Services Ltd NHS Property Services Ltd (NHSPS)	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered				Yes		Please amend policy SP8, SP9, SP10, section E. Community Infrastructure, point 13 "to read increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities.	Please amend policy SP8, SP9, SP10, section E. Community Infrastructure, point 13 "to read increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities.

	656		NHS England NHS England (NHSE)	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered				Yes		Please amend policy SP8, SP9, SP10, section E. Community Infrastructure, point 13 "to read increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities.	
	660		Mary Schoeser	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered				Question not answered		The proposed West Tey development will destroy the character of the historic town of Coggeshall, will increase pressure on the A120 that is unlikely to be resolved for a decade or more, and is ill-conceived in relation to infrastructure and the impact of years of disruptive development that will not produce a well-integrated "garden village".	
	662		Mr & Mrs Stuart & Elaine Wright	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered				Question not answered		Officer's summary: Object to West Tey, rail network is at breaking point, can't get a seat, need to leave early to park at station. Horror at prospect of countryside ruined by development.  There are many brown field sites in inner cities that should be used first before you ruin the lives of those of us who saved hard to live in a peaceful unpolluted location.	
		LPPD26	Mr Andrew Hunter, Planning Advisor - Sustainable Places Team Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No	✓					We are largely supportive of the thrust of this Policy and its various components. However, as above we consider that it is important item 18 under sub-heading F. Other Requirements "this is concerned with an upgrade to Colchester Waste Water incorpora	
		LPPD39	Historic Environment Planning Adviser, Historic England	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓			The policy contains no indication as to how the extent of the garden communities will be determined. It states that the garden communities will deliver a certain number of homes signaling that the new settlements will be housing led rather than considering the landscape and heritage assets and delivering development that has regard to these assets and which would not allow development in certain constrained areas. As such the development plan documents for each settlement should be required, through inclusion of an additional criterion in Policy SP9, to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment in accordance with our advice note 3 Site Allocations in Local Plans in order to assess impact of the proposed allocation upon the historic environment, to inform the appropriate extent of the development and establish any mitigation measures necessary. This might include appropriate safeguarding buffers around heritage assets such as historic parks and gardens, scheduled monuments, conservation areas and listed buildings and identify how the historic environment and heritage assets can form part of the development of successful schemes. See our comments regarding HIA for Garden Communities above. The area identified for the garden community includes the A120, a Roman road known as Stane Street and the A12, also a Roman road. As a consequence, there is the potential for significant archaeological interests in the vicinity of these roads. In addition, there are a number of listed buildings in the area, including Grade I listed buildings at Feering and Little Tey.	
		LPPD46	Mr Mark Behrendt	Yes	Yes	No				✓		In SP7 the absolute target of 30% is clearly set out in part v. However, in Policy SP8 and Policy SP9 these targets are set out as minimums. An essential part of the local plan is to provide certainty to the applicants and to decision makers with regard to new development. Placing a minimum on the affordable housing requirement suggests that a higher proportion may be applicable and is purely a starting point for negotiation. The local plan must be clear as to the target it is seeking in order provide a clear pricing signal to the market. This can then be factored into the price of land by developers when seeking to acquire land in these areas. To make these policies sound the affordable housing requirement in SP8, SP9 and SP10 should not be set as minimums.	To make these policies sound the affordable housing requirement in SP8, SP9 and SP10 should not be set as minimums.
		LPPD68	Mr David Moseley, Strategic Planner Persimmon Homes	Yes	Yes	Yes						[Officer summary] Persimmon Homes object to the affordable housing target of 30%(set out in Policies SP8, 9 and 10) being a"minimum". The Local Plan must set out clearly the target it is seeking to achieve and, in line with Para 173 of the NPPF, assess the implications for development viability having regard to the scale of obligations and policy burdens of the development plan as a whole. It is considered that an uncapped target does not provide certainty and could place a policy burden that would threaten viability. The market and purchasing decisions factor in policy	[Officer interpretation] Do not require 30% affordable housing as a minimum in Policies SP8, 9 or 10.



CBC rep ID	BDC rep ID	TDC rep ID	Name, Organisation		Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/ written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan
				Legally compliant										
<b>Policy SP10</b>														
6110			Richard Waylen										As long as Infrastructure is improved prior to housing development	
6304			Anglian Water (Stewart Patience)	yes	yes	no			✓		h		Reference is made to an improvements to waste water treatment and off-site improvements to the foul sewerage network which is welcomed.  It would be helpful to 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.	It is therefore proposed that Policy SP10 is amended as follows:  'Provision of improvements to waste water treatment and off-site drainage improvements to be aligned with the phasing of the development within the plan period and that proposed post 2033.'
6264			Diocese of Chelmsford (Church of England)	yes	yes	no				✓	h		Section E Community Infrastructure is not compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework because it does not mention places of worship. Section 70 of the NPPF states: "To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning [policies and decisions should: plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments."	For Policy SP10 to be sound "places of worship" needs to be included in the list of community services and facilities. Since the NPPF specifically mentions "places of worship" this policy SP10 should also specifically mention "places of worship" as it cannot be assumed that "places of worship" are included if they are not mentioned. The most appropriate place to add this information is point 12 "Community meeting places will be provided within the district and local centres including places of worship".
6350			Graham Barney	yes	yes	no				✓	W		The size and scale of the development is disproportionate to the rural nature of the area, A significant amount of Grade 2 agricultural land would be used for the final stages of this development.  The current infrastructure does not support this planned development. It will have a significant impact on additional traffic/rail travel.	Re-scale the development. Ensure all infrastructure is in place first e.g. full upgrades of A12, A120 and Rail Links, plus new roads, health centres, schools all in place before the first tranche of proposed 1500 homes is in place. Without this the development is not sustainable. Consideration needs to be given to significant employment as without it being established first the development becomes a commuter corridor contributing further to existing problems with the infrastructure.
6437			RSPB	yes	yes	no				✓	A		Point 20 only seeks the "Protection and/or enhancement of heritage and biodiversity assets". This is not consistent with the NPPF (para 156) or Policy SP7.	Remove "/or" from point 20.



6553		Campaign to Protect Rural Essex	yes	yes	no		✓	✓		h		West Braintree benefits from and supports the strategic employment zones of Skyline 120 and Panfield Lane, and being located to the west of town, is well placed for employment at Stansted, where sustainable transport solutions are proposed. However, the integrity of existing settlements, such as, Rayne and Stebbing would be under great threat from the proximity of the proposals for large scale housing developments on their borders.	We would propose that for Braintree a sequential approach to new development is more practical. We recommend that there should be a hierarchy of sites, whereby those already identified in or close to existing towns (especially 'previously developed land') should be allowed to develop first. Only when these sites have been developed sustainably and the homes occupied should the next phase of sites be released. This sequential approach should also apply to the delivery of affordable homes, homes for the elderly and social housing which will meet the urgent needs of local people. In this way supply would be matched closely to demand. The greenfield sites of the proposed garden community should be developed as a last resort and may indeed never be needed.
6749		Mike Lambert	no	no	no		✓	✓	✓	h	yes	To commit to the NGCs at this early stage would be premature and likely to put at risk the soundness of the Local Plan to deliver in the Plan period to 2033. If at a later date any one or more of the three NGCs proves to be deliverable and viable at a given scale that exceeds the 2500 in the current Plan then this should be brought forward with supporting evidence in a separate DPD at some point in the future, but preferably before development is commenced on any initial phase.	Delete
6853		Michael Frost	no	no	no		✓	✓	✓	h		I have outlined here my severe reservations over the financial viability for the WoB Garden Community and the lack of attention to safeguarding our natural amenities such as the currently active and historic airfield at Andrewsfield.	Discard the proposal for SP10 WoB for a Garden Community. Re-think the whole approach to housing using brownfield sites as a priority as per NPPF.
6913		Persimmon Homes										Officer summary -References to 'minimum' affordable housing targets should be removed.	Remove requirement in 30% affordable housing target for 'minimum' levels.
6947		Historic England			no							Officer summary - Proposed garden community could have significant impact on setting of listed buildings and Registered Park and Garden at Saling Grove. Part F (para 20) should be strengthened and amended to include reference to the heritage assets and the need to have regard to their setting when preparing more detailed planning frameworks for the site. No indication as to how the extent of the garden communities will be determined. Include an additional criterion in Policy SP10, to define appropriate safeguarding buffers around heritage assets.	Include an additional criterion in Policy SP9, to define appropriate safeguarding buffers around heritage assets such as registered parks and gardens, scheduled monuments, conservation areas and listed buildings and identify how the historic environment and heritage assets can form part of the development of successful schemes.
7095		Department of Education and Skills and Funding										Policies SP 8, 9 and 10 relate to each of the three proposed Garden Communities. Each policy requires at least one secondary school, primary schools (number and size unspecified) and early-years facilities to be provided to serve new development. The Integrated Delivery Plans for each district provide further details of the number and size of primary and secondary schools required. These details should be included in the above mentioned policies to further demonstrate that the plan has been 'positively prepared' based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed infrastructure requirements.	Include the details referenced in the IDP regarding the number and size of primary and secondary schools required for the new garden community development in Policy itself.



57		Sport England Sport England Planning Manager Eastern Region Sport England	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	Principle 15 is welcomed as it would provide the policy basis for ensuring that provision is made for green infrastructure (including outdoor sports facilities), that provides opportunities for residents of the new community to be active, to be a key part of the infrastructure of the development. Braintree District Council has recently prepared an outdoor sports evidence base which should be used for informing how this development makes provision for outdoor sport. Principle 16 is also welcomed as it makes provision for indoor leisure and sports facilities to be provided within the new community or off-site. Braintree District Council has prepared an evidence base for informing current and future facility needs for indoor sport which should be used for informing how this development makes provision for indoor sport.	
63		Mr Colin Golding	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	Braintree District Council has failed in its duty to consult and cooperate. It has failed to adequately assess the infrastructure needs and impact and it has failed to properly evaluate and alternative development strategy	Change of policy from Garden Community developments to dispersed developments through out the District
64		Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No					No	Not in compliance with NPPF policy.	
69		Mr John August Galliard Homes Ltd Agent: Mr Martin Herbert WYG	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Galliard Homes has not been given an opportunity to participate in the preparation of the Strategic Growth DPD. A1 and F19 refers to maintaining a separation between Stebbing Green and establishing landscape buffers but BDC should maximise the potential of the location to deliver housing.	
70		Mrs Amanda French	No	No	No				✓	Yes	My objections are based on environmental impact, local engagement which has not taken place with Uttlesford. Declining town centre in braintree. Brownfield sites.	Wethersfield to be included in local plan for development. Braintree town centre to be regenerated. Plus all of the above mentioned in the full representation need to be looked at in depth.
84		Mr Norman Jennings	Yes	Yes	No		✓			No	Destruction of ancient local villages. Loss of large areas of prime agricultural land. Destruction of pristine countryside including several ancient woods, full of wildlife. Destruction of historic World War 2 Airfield famous for B-26 B Marauder Bomber DN " 0131773 Flak " Bait which completed a complete series of missions flying from the airfield. Lack of infrastructure i.e. poor local roads and poor access to main railway lines. Insufficient schooling. Insufficient medical facilities. Lack of sufficient local employment.	
90		Mrs Alice Cox	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓		No	OFFICER RESPONSE Object to WBGC on financial modelling, impact on environment, transport and social considerations. Figures published page 36 Report of Strategic Director re Establishment of the North Essex Garden Communities do not add up. Who is paying for infrastructure, particularly missing items not listed in this policy. There is a lack of contingency for economic slowdown and Brexit. Essex CC could easily become bankrupt with the general public picking up the bill. Environmental concern for impact Ancient woodland, Andrewsfield and on future food production. Road infrastructure around Braintree and country lanes is unreliable and grid-locked.	Choose other land which is already ruined such as infill Braintree out to Chelmsford or Rayne
91		Mrs Joli Cole	Yes	Yes	No		✓			No	Exclude Andrews Airfield and Broxted Wood.	
92		Mr colin golding Chairman Jnt Working Group Shalford, Rayne et al	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	The representation from the Joint Parish Council Working Group was made to the BDC Local Plan Sub-Committee and we feel was totally ignored. We believe the plan is unsound as it contravenes many aspects of the NPPF including areas such as the adverse impact on the natural and historic environment, unsound and inadequate infrastructure, lack of community engagement and support, questionable financial viability and inadequate evaluation of alternative strategies such as dispersed development.	There are many factors that make West of Braintree an unsuitable site for a garden community and consequently the Plan unsound. A dispersed plan of development has not been adequately evaluated by BDC as sites brought forward under the Call for Sites were evaluated in a piecemeal approach. Dispersed development could help existing communities thrive and prosper and be far more financially viable than the Garden Community strategy.

	98	Mrs Julie Marshall	No	No	No		✓			No	O/S - Reassess the need for new homes due to leaving the EU. Need to increase food production, will urbanize villages, will be a dormitory town resulting in traffic problems on overloaded roads, need jobs and infrastructure first, not enough parking provision, increased strain on services, development are too big.	
	102	Mr & Mrs Andrew Adair	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓		Yes	OFFICER RESPONSE The new towns should be cancelled due to loss of countryside, loss of biodiversity, corrupt land procurement system, Council's conflict of interest, possibility of emolument, planning blight and conflict of interest in use of compulsory purchase. Legislation should be introduced to compel developers to build on existing brownfield sites before considering greenfield.	The removal of the New Town proposals for West & East Braintree. The introduction of legislation to compel developers/builders to build on existing brownfield sites with housing before any greenfield projects are even considered by Council Planning Committees. No further mis-use of public funds spent on promoting New Town building in North East Essex. A greater commitment by Local Councils to require builders to increase the amount of social housing on each brownfield site developed.
	103	Mrs Susan Baugh	Yes	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	CONTRAVENTION OF SO MANY PARAGRAPHS IN THE NPPF INCLUDING 151, 155, 158, 29, 30, 34, 35, 93, 95, 110, 109, 111, 112, 118, 123, 125, 126, 132, 143. IN CONTRAVENTION OF THE MAJORITY OF GARDEN CITY PRINCIPLES. THIS IS THE WRONG DEVELOPMENT IN THE WRONG PLACE. IT IS OUT OF PLACE. WHY WOULD YOU WANT TO CONCRETE OVER GREAT SWATHES OF OUR COUNTRYSIDE WHEN YOU COULD BUILD OUT FROM LOCAL TOWNS AND USE BROWNFIELD SITES?	
	113	Mr Paul Gibbs Bellway Homes Ltd Agent: Mr Olivier Spencer Associate Andrew Martin Planning	Yes	Yes	No		✓	✓	✓	Yes	In summary, it is submitted that the West of Braintree growth location and Policy SP10 fail the tests of being 'justified' (i.e. the plan should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives), 'effective' (i.e. the plan should deliverable over its period) and 'consistent with national policy' (i.e. the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development), as set out in paragraph 182 of the NPPF.	Bellway Homes preference is for the West of Braintree Garden Community to be removed from the Braintree Local Plan in its entirety and to be replaced with more sustainable housing sites on fringes of the Districts main towns. However, if this change is not supported by BDC or the Inspector appointed to consider the Plan, then a more pragmatic solution would be to: (a) identify additional housing sites around the fringes of the main towns, to ensure that the most sustainable sites in the District are allocated for growth and to boost housing supply in the early years of the plan period; (b) make a formal site allocation for the new West of Braintree growth location, to provide additional certainty regarding its deliverability and to comply with the requirements in the NPPF; and (c) reduce the housing numbers sought at the West of Braintree growth location, during the plan period, from 2,500 to 1,750, to reflect the long lead-in times prior to development. This would strengthen the Braintree Local Plan and enable the Plan to demonstrate better compliance with the soundness tests at paragraph 182 of the NPPF, without abandoning the overall North Essex Spatial Strategy and the work undertaken to date by BDC, Colchester Borough Council (CBC) and Tendring District Council (TDC).
	115	Mr Barry Stone	No	No	No		✓			No	in response to Andrews Field, i think it is a national heritage location,being used in the 2nd world war with original control tower. the airfield is one of a rapidly decreasing sites that is still fully used. i believe all the villages will merge into one huge town, losing the natural green spaces we have been lucky enough to grow up with. they must be preserved for future generations to enjoy.	Andrews Field should be preserved and not built on.

126		Mr Kevin Fraser Principal Planner, Spatial Planning Team Essex County Council Spatial Planning	Yes	Yes	Yes			✓		No	The change refers to the transport network rather than merely the road network. Longer term transport interventions will need to be carefully designed to minimise the impacts on the strategic and local transport road network and fully mitigate any environmental or traffic impacts arising from the development. These shall include bus (or other public transit provisions) priority measures between the site, University of Essex, Hythe station and Colchester Town Centre;	
129		Mr Neil Birks	No	No	No			✓		Yes	I object to the West of Braintree proposed development on the basis that it is environmentally destructive to some of the most beautiful countryside in North Essex. I also object on the basis that this proposed development, so close to Braintree, will in time lead to ugly urban sprawl. Braintree already has two centres - the old town centre and the new Freeport centre, with all land in between being developed. Indeed, most land between the town centre and bypass has been developed. The West of Braintree Garden Village, so close to Braintree, will eventually become as one with the urban sprawl of Braintree, but with no definable centre. Just characterless urban sprawl, creating a disjointed and congested heartless development, leading to further erosion of the rural nature of this beautiful part of Essex. Thanks!	The assumption that people will use public transport / walk to get from one conurbation to the next is unrealistic. And indeed the distance you are assuming people will walk to get to public transport.
131		Mr Roland Stanley	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes	In summary, Paragraph 182 of the NPPF states that for a local plan to be considered sound it should be "Positively Prepared, Justified, Effective and Consistent with National Policy", SP10, West of Braintree fails on all counts. There are a multitude of factors from both a financial and a planning perspective which need to be addressed before the proposed West of Braintree settlement proposal can realistically be seen as a viable or sustainable contributor of housing over the plan period. There are alternative realistic sustainable sites that BDC should be considering including; Temple Border and the brownfield site at the RAF base at Wethersfield	
135		Mr Neil Birks	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes	BDC have consulted but ignored the responses as with the first consultation where not one resident replied in favour. BDC have failed in their duty to cooperate with Uttlesford District Council. A back to back development with two centres is absurd. There has been inadequate consideration of the impact on the transport infrastructure and it will lead to overcrowding of already congested roads including minor country roads which are already "rat runs". BDC have ignored the natural environment of the area, proposing to destroy ancient woodland and flora and fauna in the area. BDC have failed to consider an alternative strategy of dispersed development. I have also formed the opinion, along with Colin, that West of Braintree was predetermined as a development site from the beginning of the process of the Local Plan consultation	Take on board objections from the local communities. Refuse to allow a cross boundary development backing onto the UDC planned development, Preserve ancient woodland, and prime flora and fauna.
139		Mrs Diana Christopher	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓			No	The plan for this community is unsuitable because it is too large and too far from the necessary infrastructure and will never be able to become sufficiently self sustained. There will never be adequate employment in the area to support the development meaning many will still seek employment elsewhere. Arable land needed for food production will be lost, water supplies are already poor and transport needs cannot be met with the existing road network and distance to railways. Roads are already congested and local villages will be overwhelmed with traffic problems on narrow and dangerous lanes. There is no additional hospital provision and children will initially have to be transported elsewhere for secondary education.	All brownfield sites should be used before any arable land and countryside is destroyed. Each community should be expanding as its needs require with a fairer distribution throughout the Braintree area

142	Miss Caroline Ratcliff	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	With specific reference to SP10: the omission of the exceptional Heritage Asset of the Humphry Repton Georgian landscape setting at Saling Grove, Great Saling, described as the most complete house, garden, park and landscape in its original form within Essex. This landscape setting as Repton designed goes beyond the Historic England's currently protected registered park and garden. SP10 directly abuts the protected land and therefore fatally truncates the intended view and setting which has matured and been preserved for over 200 years. It can not be replaced. Other issues insufficient green buffer protection (one field apart) to prevent coalescence of proposed New Town to Great Saling village.	SP10 Inclusion and acknowledgement of the exceptional Heritage Asset and Setting of Saling Grove and its Humphry Repton landscape when considering SP10. Local knowledge errors re Saling Hall, Village conservation area.
144	Mr Greg King Clerk Stebbing Parish Council	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes	Stebbing Parish Council asserts that the Braintree Local Plan is NOT sound in planning terms. The Duty to Cooperate has not been sufficiently fulfilled with particular regard to Uttlesford. It is premature with regard to Mineral Safeguarding. It is not sustainable in regard to the N.P.P.F.	We have no suggestions to make the plan work and would suggest that Braintree reconsider the plan before its submission to the inspector.
146	Mr Tim Gray	Yes	Yes	No		✓			No	O/S - Development will dwarf rural communities in that area impacting lifestyles and ways of life, holistic approach should be taken regarding transport and infrastructure, need to consider available jobs. Expansion at Stansted not agreed, impacts on the natural environment. Farming is important, smaller development more desirable.	
149	Ms Jane Bennett	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes	Not Sound: - No infrastructure Prime Agricultural land is earmarked for development Brown field sites are not considered therefore not legally compliant Ancient woodland potentially destroyed. Lack of water supply Lack of schools Lack of medical centres Failure to co-operate with other large towns who have infrastructure in place, M11 corridor developments not considered No employment locally	Consider brown field sites Consider M11 corridor sites
152	Mr Alan Wallace	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓		No	WoB contravenes great swathes of the NPPF. BDC and AECOM's arguments show many glaring weaknesses. BDC have failed to consider other potential sites properly. Mineral deposits.	
171	Mr Edward Charlesworth	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	West of Braintree is an ill-thought-out approach to providing housing during the plan period. It is unsound, ineffective and has not properly consulted with the residents.	Braintree should entirely rethink its selection of West of Braintree as a suitable site for a 30,000 person town. Unless a region-wide transportation and employment strategy is implemented first, West of Braintree (and West Tey for that matter) risk overloading an already overstretched road network. I, along with many others, drive more than 10 miles in order to commute to London by train. Unless new developments are placed near existing transport and/or employment hubs there is little hope of creating anything but a remote dormitory exacerbating all the current road problems around Braintree, a witham, Stansted, Stortford and Chelmsford.
181	Mrs Andrea Hydes	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	The plan is unsound. There is no way the local area can cope with a development of this size. There must be more appropriate land sites in Braintree which could be utilised.	i cannot comment on the changes needed, this is for the council to demonstrate.

187	Bellway Homes Limited - Strategic Growth Agent: Mr Andrew Martin Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	No		✓	✓	✓	Yes	It is not sustainable: The West of Braintree, Garden Community proposal has substandard access to public transport and poor connectivity to facilities in higher order centres. It also will adversely impact on historic settlements (Stebbing & Great Sailing) and sensitive landscapes (Boxted Wood). Unsuitable highway access: Vehicular access is proposed via the A120 and B1256. Improvements to the A120 are identified in the Uttlesford Preferred Options Document (2017) exhibiting the issues with cross boundary proposals. The existing partial junction at the A120 restricts highway access to development, facilitating just eastern routes. Delay in development: The preparation of a site specific DPD, risk of call-in by Secretary of State and the assumption of mineral extraction before 2026/27 could lead to severe delays in development causing a shortfall to the housing trajectory.	Removal of the West of Braintree Garden Community from Braintree Local Plan in its entirety and replacement with more suitable housing sites on fringes of the District's main towns.
188	Mrs Nina Crabb Planning Advisor National Trust Agent: Mrs Nina Crabb	Yes	Yes	No				✓	Yes	Policy SP10 requires the development to provide links to the Fritch Way Country Park. This is a well-used walking and cycle path which provides direct access to Hatfield Forest (a SSSI, Nature Reserve and Ancient Woodland). The number of homes proposed, along with the proximity of the site to Hatfield Forest and the good transport links will undoubtedly add to the pressure on the Forest which is already operating beyond capacity.	The policy to include the requirement for mitigation measures to address impacts upon areas of nature conservation, landscape and recreational importance.
195	Mrs Victoria Roberts	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	Not positively prepared but quota reactionary. Not justified - this is not the most appropriate strategy (destroying villages and countryside) when a reasonable alternative brownfield site in Wethersfield exists. The councils have failed in their duty to co-operate. The impact of WoB will largely be felt in UDC sitting as it does on the border - but the local plans are progressing entirely separately with no joined up thinking or representations to residents.	There are no recommendations that could be made to make this plan sound.
196	Ms Louise Ratcliff	Yes	Yes	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	Braintree District Councils own Heritage Statement states that the proposals to develop the area all around Great Saling is contentious and should be avoided'. SP10 direct borders one of the best preserved Repton designed parks in the county which is within the conservation area of Great Saling. The villages of Gt Saling and Stebbing have a heritage level code colour of red and amber by the BDC which the the draft local plan seemingly fails to acknowledge or value. Danger of coalscence combined with developments along the A120 & north of Gt Saling will put on unnecessary pressure on infrastructure and resources without evidence of real long term job creation, creating a linear housing estate from Dunmow - Braintree. Insufficient coordination between the UDC & BDC for the public to understand the overall impact of the development. The proposals for SP10 to be presented to the public in joint consultation and not in separate local plans.	coordination between UDC and BDC for SP10 heritage asset protection coalscence protection
198	Mr Peter Merifield	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		No	1. Loss of agricultural land. 2. Failure to consider Wethersfield Airfield. 3. Lack of road and rail communication. 4. Lack of reliable water supplies. 5. Lack of health facilities. 6. Lack of educational services. 7. Lack of adequate policing.	It is not possible to make a sound plan requiring so many additional houses with such scarce resources. The housing problem is mainly driven by London's failure to provide adequate housing stocks and it is their problem to sort it out, not ours.

202		Mr & Mrs Andrew Martin Agent: Mr Andrew Martin Andrew Martin - Planning Limited	Yes	Yes	No		✓		✓	Yes		The evidence base for the proposal is seriously flawed and fails to recognise the special character of the countryside between Stebbing and Great Saling and its heritage assets. There are better and more sustainable locations for a new garden community to the east of Braintree. It is not sustainable: The West of Braintree Garden Community proposal has substandard access to public transport and poor connectivity to facilities in higher order centres. It also will adversely impact on historic settlements (Stebbing & Great Sailing) and sensitive landscapes (Boxted Wood). Unsuitable highway access: Vehicular access is proposed via the A120 and B1256. Improvements to the A120 are identified in the Uttlesford Preferred Options Document (2017) exhibiting the issues with cross boundary proposals. Delay in development: The assumption of mineral extraction before 2026/27 could lead to severe delays and housing shortfall.	Removal of the West of Braintree Garden Community from Braintree Local Plan in its entirety and replacement with more suitable housing sites on fringes of the District's main towns.
216		Mr Peter Williams Director Williams Group Agent: Mrs Teresa Cook Principal Consultant Emery Planning Partnership Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		OS - Proposal is too conceptual to include in plans. The Local Plan needs more firm proposals.	The number of homes stated to be delivered in Braintree District at the West of Braintree Garden Community site during the plan period should be reduced in line with the review of delivery rates as described in our response to Policy SP2.
225		Mrs Julie Gray	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No		I believe the plan is not sound in planning, the Duty to Cooperate is not fulfilled, it is not a sustainable plan.	None. Braintree to reconsider.
234		Mr Stuart McAdam	Yes	Yes	No		✓	✓	✓	Yes		Persimmon Homes strongly suggest Braintree is at risk of not being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply during in the course of the plan period and the delivery of sufficient housing within the overall Plan period. The Draft Local Plan does not: - adequately consider increased migration from London - impact of London not meeting its own housing need - Effectively assess key market signals In order to future proof the plan, it is suggested that the Council should seek to allocate reserved sites which can be brought forward if Braintree see an increase in their housing needs	It is considered that an uncapped target does not provide certainty and could place a policy burden that would threaten viability. The market and purchasing decisions factor in policy requirements and not having clarity would give rise to significant uncertainty that would not assist delivery.
236		Mr Colin Davidson	No	No	No					No		As a layman and resident I would suggest that BDC has not considered using appropriate 'brown field' sites which are already close to existing infrastructure. Andrews field which is a fully functional training and leisure facility is split between BDC and UDC. They have no collaborative plan. West of Braintree would be reliant on car use. There is limited local employment most residents would have to commute to London, Cambridge etc. contributing to even more pollution on the already congested A120 and M11. BDC assume that a quarter of residents will work from home. This figure seems to have been picked out of the air. The impact on the local environment would be devastating, threatening ancient woodland, grade 2 farmland and historical villages.	
237		mrs Vicky Skilton	No	No	No					No		Lack of infrastructure	Build in already developed areas with good road infrastructure
238		Mr Christopher Skilton	No	No	No					Yes		OFFICER RESPONSE Object to WBGC, 10,000 houses would be 50,000 people and lead to grid locked roads. Two villages would be lost.	We have a raft of sound reasons why the proposed housing plan is not legally compliant and these will be disclosed @ a later date if the Stebbing area is included in the new town.
241		Robyn Cornelius	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No		I am opposed to the WOB Garden Development. Please see above.	Justify why brownfield hasn't been put forward as preferred choice. Unacceptable travel/car increase Not compliant with TCPA



	242	Mr Stewart Cornelius	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	I am opposed to WOB. Please see above.	Justify use of green field land against other brown field sites. Explain how travel will occur without cars. Explain how compliant TCPA
	249	Environment Agency Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No				✓	No	OFFICER RESPONSE Support reference to provision of improvements to waste water treatments however it requires amendment to clearly signpost the IDP. We have been working with AECOM and Anglian Water on the preparation of an Integrated Water Management Strategy (IWMS) for the Garden Communities. A draft IWMS stage 2 report is expected to be made available to us and AW August 2017. Stage 1 IWMS highlighted that the scale and location of development across the Garden Communities poses significant challenges around provision of water supply, wastewater services and management of flood risk and that the final garden communities does not have identified solutions. IWMS Stage 2 will develop a range of delivery option strategies based on a series of potential measures. IWMS Stage 2, and where considered necessary, an IWMS Stage 3 should provide the necessary evidence to support the development of the respective garden communities without impacting on the environment.	Item 17 should be re-worded along the following lines: Provision of improvements, ahead of development, to waste water treatment including an upgrade to the Colchester Waste Water Treatment Plan in accordance with the programme set out in the Braintree Infrastructure Delivery Plan and off-site drainage improvements. The purpose here is to set out a clear signposting of infrastructure delivery requirements as evaluated under the BIDP. It should be noted that the priority for this infrastructure type is described as critical under Table 13.1, which is presumably a reflection of its importance. We understand the Braintree Infrastructure Delivery Plan has already been published and whilst it does show a programme for water infrastructure, this appears to have been based on the water cycle studies carried out at the individual local planning authority level. Given this, it might be preferable for a standalone detailed IWMS delivery plan for the preferred strategy for the Garden Communities to be provided for evidence purposes in support of the water infrastructure requirements for Section 1 of the Local Plan.
	251	Mrs Tracy Gibson	Yes	No	No	✓	✓	✓		No	In my opinion the Local Plan is not sound due to strain on the already over-stretched services/infra-structure and Braintree District Council has not complied with the Duty to Co-Operate with neighbouring Uttlesford - a vast amount of houses is planned by both councils in a very small area.	I have no suggestions, but perhaps a re-think with respect to UDC's proposed plans may be in order.
	252	Mrs Georgina Going	No	No	No		✓			No	I do not think the proposal to build the West of Braintree settlement is sound. There will be a loss of agricultural land, loss of an ancient wood and an amenity (Andrews Airfield). The A120 is already congested and as there are few jobs available locally those who purchase houses in the settlement will need to travel to Cambridge or London to work and will thus add to the congestion in this area. Public transport is practically non-existent in the case of buses and woefully inadequate in the case of trains. The plan does not seem to address the infrastructure needed nor the provision of doctors surgeries and schools. There is a great deal of house building going on around Dunmow, Felsted and Takeley already. I would suggest that these new homes will provide the necessary number needed.	
	253	Mr Patrick Going	No	No	No				✓	No	Draft Plan is unsound primarily because there are very few job vacancies in Braintree area which will mean all the housing will be taken by people who will commute to either London or Cambridge. This will overload the A120 and surrounding roads leading to gridlock in a short space of time. The Plan is therefore unsound in that all house building should take place on the M11 corridor either next to Cambridge or further south to Harlow. The plan is also unsound in that the present infra structure will not support a Garden Village and nothing in the plan can guarantee that infra structure will be built.	

254		Mrs Kate Fox Clerk Great Bardfield PC	Yes	Yes	No		✓	✓		No	The proposed GC at WOB is not supported by Great Bardfield PC. Concerns re negative impact on neighbouring rural communities including Great Bardfield - he proximity to WOB e.g. increased traffic, insufficient transport and social infrastructure. The provision of services and facilities are likely to be focussed on WOB and other communities and facilities likely to be disadvantaged. New proposed flight paths for Stansted directly cross WOB. Concern over loss of agricultural land and ancient woodland. We do not believe that all potential brownfield sites, including unoccupied housing/other redundant buildings, have been identified and included in the LPP.	
255		Professor Colin Harrison	No	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	Unsound or no planning concerns for transport, water, healthcare and agriculture. Massive detrimental impact on local villages. Better M11 corridor positions available that would meet at least transport objections.	
256		Mrs Patricia Harrison	No	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	Unsound or no planning concerns for transport, water, healthcare and agriculture. Massive detrimental impact on local villages. Better M11 corridor positions available that would meet at least transport objections.	
258		Mr and Mrs David and Penelope Learmonth	Yes	Yes	No				✓	No	The Plan is not sound in main areas of infrastructure, use of farmland which erodes food security, no consideration of the wider impact on this area.	The Plan should address the infrastructure before all else. The cost implications should be transparent.
259		Manager SERCLE Campaign	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes	There are a multitude of factors from both a financial and a planning perspective which need to be addressed before West of Braintree can realistically be seen as a viable or sustainable contributor of housing over the plan period. Whilst the need for more housing is not in doubt, the proposed location with its lack of existing infrastructure an absence of any compelling characteristics which would attract employers, developers or residents, makes the likelihood of it delivering any meaningful number of houses before 2033 very low. The lack of a realistic land purchase and funding strategy also makes WoB, along with the other Garden Settlements, a hugely risky gamble with taxpayers money. Even the most successful New Towns such as Milton Keynes have been proven not to be profitable in the long term. Essex County Council and Braintree District Council simply cannot afford to support an ill-conceived and incredibly risky enterprise such as this.	In summary, there are a multitude of factors from both a financial and a planning perspective which need to be addressed before West of Braintree can realistically be seen as a viable or sustainable contributor of housing over the plan period. Whilst the need for more housing is not in doubt, the proposed location with its lack of existing infrastructure an absence of any compelling characteristics which would attract employers, developers or residents, makes the likelihood of it delivering any meaningful number of houses before 2033 very low. The lack of a realistic land purchase and funding strategy also makes WoB, along with the other Garden Settlements, a hugely risky gamble with taxpayers money. Even the most successful New Towns such as Milton Keynes have been proven not to be profitable in the long term. Essex County Council and Braintree District Council simply cannot afford to support an ill-conceived and incredibly risky enterprise such as this.
260		Mrs Diana Roe	Question not answered	Question not answered	No					No	Officer Response: Challenging the contents of the Plan is even more difficult due to use of complicated forms. Objections of all the neighbouring parish councils have been overridden without alternatives being considered. A referendum on such a fundamental change would have been more representative and a proper collective enterprise. The garden community would be thus dwarfing Braintree and the surrounding historic villages, decimating ancient woodlands and wildlife and destroying a vibrant, working and training airfield. The financial risks are nor correctly assessed. Significant investment in roads, water, electricity, gas and sewage disposal needed. There are no plans to build a new hospital and Broomfield and Colchester are already under great pressure. Public transport, walking and cycling goals are unrealistic. Smaller settlements that do not attract so many outsiders would help to spread the load.	Reassessing the number of homes required Reviewing the plan to have large settlements and changing to more smaller settlements in keeping with the rural area More building on brownfield sites, including soon to be available Wethersfield base Reassessing the financial risks

261		Mrs Vanessa James	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓		No	The West of Braintree Garden Community (WBGC) has not been positively prepared, nor is it justified, nor effective in that: 1. it is being marketed as being able to provide 10,000-13,000 homes which is significantly in excess of Braintree's needs and the needs of Uttlesford DC; 2. it is not proportionate or appropriate when considering the destruction of the rural nature of the locality, the destruction of the open countryside and the loss of the local historical airfield (Andrewsfield); and 3. There is insufficient infrastructure to cope with the results of the development, nor any proposals in the Plan to implement the major infrastructure projects that would be required.	Removal of WBGC option.
262		Miss Sarah Walker	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes	I strongly oppose the proposed development of the 'West of Braintree Garden Community' on the grounds that it is not sound. It has not been prepared positively, in that it does not meet the infrastructure requirements of the proposed village community in terms of: utilities; transport; employment; education and health care. See above for a catalogue of infrastructure concerns. The plan is not justified - there are more appropriate alternatives to the West of Braintree new town, offering more sustainable development, at a lower cost to the environment. It is not effective as there is no sound infrastructure delivery planning - the proposal is not workable. In addition, the Council has not complied with its Duty to Co-operate. There have been no consultation with local residents in Uttlesford - despite the fact that the site borders villages in Uttlesford and will have a massive detrimental impact on Uttlesford residents.	The proposed West of Braintree 'Garden Community', which is actually a 'New Town' should be dropped completely. The Braintree District plan should be revised to meeting the required housing targets through smaller developments, spread more equitably across the District, to villages and other settlements where there is demand and local support for development. Brown field sites should be prioritised ahead of green field sites. Proposals to build on grade 2 agricultural land should be dropped. Braintree should not take any development from other areas, which are already meeting their targets. New developments should be located in proximity to other new developments, i.e. new towns and cities, such as Harlow and Chelmsford, instead of locating them close to historical villages and detracting from them and destroying our valuable heritage for ever.
263		Mr Russell Turner	No	No	No		✓			Yes	Transport, education, employment, health care provision. All of these points are not sound. The plan itself is flawed in many ways, and is not sustainable.	I don't think this plan can be made sound. In its present form it has too many failings.
264		Mr Brad Pearman	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	Lack of consultation with local villages, which shows a lack of engagement about providing workable change whereby all involved can support and play their part. This plan is not inclusive, it is dictatorial. The impact on local agriculture, which will be lost. The vast increase in local population size which will lead to more cars on the roads as there are simply not enough employment opportunities to support a population increase of this size.	Engagement with local villages and residents. Accepting that we still need to respect our environment and our food supplies.
265		Mrs Pamela Blackburn	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Question not answered	Far too big a development. Ruination of beautiful rural Essex. Loss of ancient woodland. Destruction of peaceful, thriving Andrewsfield and certainly the surrounding hamlets and villages.	
267		Choice Construction Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
268		Barkley Projects Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.

269		Mr Watson-Steele Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
270		Mr Gavin Day DSG Developments Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
271		Mr D P Nott Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	Question not answered	Question not answered		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
272		Granville Developments Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	Question not answered	Question not answered		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
273		Mr Lightly Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
274		Mrs D Golding Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
275		Mr W Kerry Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
276		Pertwee Estates Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
277		Mr G Williamson Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.

279		Mrs J Sawyer Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
280		Mr C Coghlan Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
281		Mr R Carter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
282		Mr M Harrington Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
283		Mr Martin Cowan Poplar Nurseries Ltd Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
287		Mr M Spurgeon Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
288		Mr D Clough Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
289		Mr & Mrs Harrison Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
290		The Shepherd Trust Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.

291	Mr C Reid Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
292	Mr D White Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
293	Mssrs Parmenter Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
294	Mrs D Morrall Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
295	Mr C Hart Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	he location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
296	Mr M Allard Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
325	Mr Andy Bennett	No	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	Officer Comment: Object to new town west of Braintree. Concerned with the impact on neighbouring settlements in particular congestion. A new town of 40 thousand people cannot be serviced on existing local roads through adding a slip road onto the A120 " assumes no north or south travel. The council isn't looking at questions in detail - this is a fundamental disconnect with the communities in and around the proposed development area. Consultation comments are being ignored and this is a fundamental failure of the Local Plan.	
337	Mrs K Bennett	No	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The officers and councillors supporting this ill-conceived plan are producing massive convoluted and jargon-packed documents to try and confuse and obfuscate their biased and flawed proposals. They delight in the 'concept' but have utterly failed to either engage with, or listen to, the very sensible concerns and practicalities raised by the local communities they are intent on destroying. They have not listened to, let alone considered, many vital factors that will lead to a huge public spend and huge public loss. They have failed to consult and involve the community adequately.	
341	Mr M Harrington Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The case for the proposed Garden Communities has not been adequately justified " especially in relation to the ability to fund such large developments and to deliver the housing capacity claimed prior to 2033. Employment generation is uncertain and this runs the risk of new, unsustainable settlements being created.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this specific Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable long term Spatial Strategy and reallocate the pre-2033 housing capacity, earmarked for this Garden Community, elsewhere.

380		Mr C Reid Agent: Mr Edward Gittins Director Edward Gittins & Associates	Yes	No	No		✓	✓		Yes	The location and scale of this Garden Community is not adequately justified and is premature pending decisions on the A120.	Exclude references and proposals relating to this Garden Community, refer to a separate DPD to establish the most sustainable post-2033 Spatial Strategy and reallocate pre-2033 housing capacity for this Garden Community elsewhere.
462		Mrs Sylvia Jiggins	Yes	Yes	Question not answered					Yes	2.4 Consideration of Alternatives Pages 18 and 19 Option 1: Northern Scheme and Option 2: Northern Scheme reduced Either of these options are preferred as they allow the proposed gravel extraction site at Broadfields Farm to be restored as a wetland nature reserve that would be an excellent example of how to help wildlife thrive alongside housing development. The site, which should be open to the public, should be owned and managed by the local authority or an organization such as the Essex Wildlife Trust and would give opportunities for wildlife education to all ages of the local population. Development of this nature would put Braintree District in the forefront of wildlife conservation, providing an example for other local authorities to follow.	
465		Mr Roger Jiggins Rayne Parish Councillor	Yes	Yes	Question not answered					No	The proposed high quality restoration of the gravel extraction site should be pursued and not built on. It should then be retained in public ownership. The Uttlesford Garden Village proposal adjoining the above site has not been taken into account. This would increase the overall number of houses in the combined development to an unacceptable size for this site.	
501		Andrewsfield New Settlement Consortium Agent: Mr David Maxwell GL Hearn	Yes	Yes	Yes			✓		Yes	O/S - ANSC supports the potential delivery of the WBGC via a local delivery vehicle. Agree that supply of new homes can be best achieved through larger scale developments.	
505		Andrewsfield New Settlement Consortium Agent: Mr David Maxwell GL Hearn	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	OFFICER RESPONSE Support for the WBGC including provision for 30% Affordable Housing and policy requirements. Support for detailed master planning and design guidance through a separate Development Plan Document. ANSC recognise the benefits of long-term governance and stewardship arrangements for community assets provided within the WBGC. ANSC technical evidence base is enclosed comprising: Landscape Assessment; Heritage Assessment; Transport Assessment; Contamination Assessment; Ecology Assessment; and a Viability Assessment.	
509		Andrewsfield New Settlement Consortium Agent: Mr David Maxwell GL Hearn	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Andrewsfield New Settlement Consortium (ANSC) supports Map 10.2A - West of Braintree, at page 67 of the Reg. 19 Braintree Local Plan. Map 10.2A identifies a very similar site boundary for the WBGC as the land promoted by ANSC towards the Braintree and Uttlesford call for sites and previous Local Plan consultations. Map 12.2A also accords with the extent of land identified within the Development Vision for land at Andrewsfield (copy enclosed) prepared by GL Hearn (part of Capita Real Estate). It is submitted that Map 12/2A - West of Braintree should be amended to reflect the Uttlesford Reg. 18 Local Plan, July 2017, also including land within Uttelsford District as part of the WBGC.	
516		Essex Farms Agent: Mr Steven Bainbridge Associate Evolution Town Planning LLP	Yes	Yes	No		✓	✓	✓	Yes	These representations support the proposal for a new Garden Settlement to the west of Braintree - the West of Braintree Garden Community. The representations also propose the inclusion of an additional area of land within the West of Braintree Garden Community 'search area' in order to ensure the plan is effective, justified and consistent with national policy, and to make the Plan 'sound'.	In order to make the Plan sound, a change to the Policies Map is required, extending the area of land identified for the West of Braintree Garden Community in line with the plan submitted and contained within Appendix 1 of the attached submission.

517		Mrs Cathryn Carlisle Clerk Shalford Parish Council	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes	BDC failed in its duty to cooperate BDC failed to fully asses the infrastructure needs and impact BDC failed to adequately asses the effect on commerce and employment BDC failed to adequately asses the effect on the natural environment BDC failed to consider an alternative strategy including publishing a Brownfield site register and have shown predetermination throughout the whole Local Plan process.	
523		Gateway 120 Ltd Agent: Mr David Churchill ICENI Projects	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Yes	We support the production of a new Local Plan in principle and have worked closely with the Councils to date in the delivery of the Local Plan. In particular we support the Section 1 Plan, with particular regard to Policies SP7 and SP9. We feel there are a number of areas the Councils need to strengthen their evidence base to ensure a sound and legally compliant Local Plan is demonstrated. We are happy to continue working with the Councils in delivering this.	Whilst we feel the principle of the Local Plan to date has been sound and legally compliant, there are a number of areas detailed within the representations where further evidence is required. We will continue to work with the Councils to ensure this evidence is delivered.
551		Mr Phil Bamford Planning Manager Gladman Developments Ltd	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes	O/S - Gladman consider that the Garden Communities will not deliver units as quickly as the Council expect and therefore further smaller scale housing sites will be required to be allocated to deliver in the short term.	
554		McDonnell Mohan Ltd McDonnell Mohan Ltd Agent: Mr Mark Jackson	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes	The site being promoted for Allocation is 4.6ha for employment development on the border of Braintree and Uttlesford District. The submissions made to the Council in March 2015 stated: œThe proposal is for the allocation of the site for commercial warehouse and distribution use falling within Use Class B8. The site is well screened. Its value as Agricultural land has been diminished by the routing of the A120(T) and the formation of the B1417. The site is extremely accessible for the Strategic A120 (T) linking to the M11 and Stansted Airport and the A12 trunk road. !• The submission also included a Master Plan taking account of the on-site constraints. The site area is now, partly shown within the West of Braintree Garden Community, policies SP 7 and SP 10 of the Publication Draft refers.	That the site is included in the Draft Policies SP 7, SP 10 and the is shown within Map 10.2 A Land West of Braintree or its substitute. There is no logical reason that this land between the old A120 and new A120 should remain as agricultural land, undeveloped, for the reasons set out above.
567		Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No		✓	✓	✓	Yes	The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	D7 " Add These shall ideally include a new railway station at the development linking to the Braintree line (as in Option 1 of the Options & Evaluation study 2016) all effort being made to secure delivery via Government support to Network Rail (and the option may be part of a new East-West rail line), the inter-urban and inter-regional connections to ensure that the majority of the journeys created by the development are no car based.
575		Mrs D Smith Clerk Felsted Parish Council	Yes	Yes	Yes					No	O/S - Concerned about on traffic in Felsted parish and on its public services. Difficult to see meaningful impact of the consultation on the growth location selection.	



	576		Ms Judith Such	Question not answered	Question not answered	No		✓	✓	✓	Question not answered	The proposed development will erode and possibly totally destroy, the special environment and heritage east of and up to Stebbing Green. The development supported by Uttlesford Council neither conserves nor enhances our natural and historic landscape and farmland. The inadequacies of proposed transport links other than by road mean that these are unviable and extremely unlikely to take priority over car use. Primary vehicular access to the site will be via the A120 and B1256. The subsequent increase in road traffic will not protect existing, or future, residents with regard to noise, vibration and smell. Increased pollution will have adverse effects on the health of residents. Finally, I am not convinced that Uttlesford Council is confident that necessary requirements can or will be secured.	
	580		Mr William Lee	Yes	Yes	No		✓	✓	✓	Yes	The thrust of my argument is that these Garden Communities policies are not ambitious and prescriptive enough as regards realistic integrated transport and low energy use solutions, given the likely movement patterns of new residents and the need for a step change in the way we use energy to meet the UKs climate change commitments. In particular I do not consider the Braintree West site has been fully objectively tested. It performs much worse in terms of impact on valuable landscape and best and most versatile agricultural land, a policy condition and without an upfront commitment to a rail extension it will fail to meet the wider objectives, will perform poorly and will have perverse negative effects on North Essex.	
	590		Mr Oliver Marigold Principle Planner Tetlow King Planning	Yes	Yes	No				✓	No	We consider that a number of amendments are necessary to the Publication Draft Local Plan, to ensure that the full opportunity of a rent to buy model is included within the definition of affordable housing.	See above
	595		Mr Michael Allpress	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Question not answered	O/S - objection to west of Braintree.	
	601		Mrs Carol Richards Diocese of Chelmsford	Question not answered	Question not answered	No					Question not answered	O/S - not sound as it does not mention places of worship as per paragraph 70 of the NPPF.	For Policy SP10 to be sound places of worship needs to be included in the list of community services and facilities. Since the NPPF specifically mentions places of worship this policy SP10 should also specifically mention places of worship as it cannot be assumed that places of worship are included if they are not mentioned. The most appropriate place to add this information is point 12 Community meeting places will be provided within the district and local centres including places of worship .
	602		G.C Davidson	Yes	Yes	No			✓		No	O/S - Traffic and housing need further consideration, Electric vehicles still need to be parked and used. housing mix and space for waste storage and collection. Rail link east to west needed.	As above
	603		Ms Amanda Courtauld	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes	See paragraph one above please. The plan fails to amend or reflect the historic asset, 'Fatally Compromising the setting of the landscape' David Andrews Essex Gardens Trust. 'Saling Grove, with its house and grounds in tact, is probably the best preserved Repton landscape in the country'. David Andrews Senior County Listings Officer.	To remove any proposals that in any way affect this Humphrey Repton registered historic park, gardens with landscape setting.

	607		Cllr James Abbott Silver End & Cressing Ward	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	Yes		Delete West of Braintree from the plan or reduce the allocation to that required in the plan period (2,500).	Delete West of Braintree from the plan or reduce it to the required allocation for this site in the plan period of 2,500 houses.
	613		Mr James Stevens Home Builders Federation	Yes	Yes	No				✓	Yes		O/S - Welcome commitment to new settlements. Clarification needed regarding affordable housing and should not be set as minimums.	Based on both increased migration from London and concerns regarding affordability we would suggest the following OANs for each of the three Councils forming part of the 'North Essex' area: Braintree " 762 dpa (623 starting point plus 12 units for London migration scenario and a 20% uplift) Colchester " 1002 dpa (866 starting point plus 45 units for London migration scenario and a 10% uplift) Tendring " 776 dpa (675 plus 15% uplift) This level of delivery would require the North Essex HMA to deliver 2540 homes per annum, a total of 50,800 new homes between 2013 and 2033.
	614		Cllr James Abbott Silver End & Cressing Ward	No	No	No	✓	✓	✓		Yes		Include a map showing the whole of the area proposed Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community at the same scale as in Map 10.2B (ie all of that in Braintree District & Colchester Borough).	To make the plan sound and compliant there needs to be a map included showing the full extent of the proposed Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community.
	617		C S Bright	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Question not answered		O/S - Objection to housing at Marks Tey and Saling. Will this benefit local people houses unlikely to be affordable. Loss of agricultural land is a concern, no local employment, Plans should be national not local. Traffic is also an issue. Housing should be affordable.	
	623		Mr Don Smith Chairman - Rayne Parish Council Rayne Parish Council	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Question not answered		O/S - Lack of real information on garden communities across the boards, with lots of aspirations but no assessment of their real impact. No commitment to infrastructure prior to any building work.	
	633		Mr Douglas McNab Forward Planning Manager - South East Education and Skills Funding Agency Department For Education	Yes	Yes	Yes					No		The ESFA also welcomes the focus in policy SP7 on the sequencing of development and infrastructure provision to ensure that the latter is provided ahead of or in tandem with the development it supports. Policies SP 8, 9 and 10 relate to each of the three proposed Garden Communities. Each policy requires at least one secondary school, primary schools (number and size unspecified) and early-years facilities to be provided to serve new development. The Integrated Delivery Plans for each district provide further details of the number and size of primary and secondary schools required. These details should be included in the above mentioned policies to further demonstrate that the plan has been positively prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed infrastructure requirements.	
	648		Dr Natalie Gates Principal Advisor, Historic Places Team Historic England	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered					Question not answered		O/S - The proposed garden community could have a significant impact on heritage assets, policy needs further reference to those assets and have regard to their setting. Needs policy on determining the extent of the development. Policy needs to define appropriate safeguarding and buffers around heritage assets.	

	651		NHS Mid Essex CCG NHS Mid Essex Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered				Yes	Please amend policy SP8, SP9, SP10, section E. Community Infrastructure, point 13 "to read increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities.	Please amend policy SP8, SP9, SP10, section E. Community Infrastructure, point 13 "to read increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities.
	654		NHS Property Services Ltd NHS Property Services Ltd (NHSPS)	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered				Yes	Please amend policy SP8, SP9, SP10, section E. Community Infrastructure, point 13 "to read increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities.	Please amend policy SP8, SP9, SP10, section E. Community Infrastructure, point 13 "to read increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities.
	657		NHS England NHS England (NHSE)	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered				Yes	Please amend policy SP8, SP9, SP10, section E. Community Infrastructure, point 13 "to read increased primary care capacity will be provided to serve the new development, this may be by means of improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities.	
	661		Mr Roy Sefton	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered				Question not answered	O/S - West Tey not sustainable or affordable and is in the wrong place. Existing infrastructure and access at capacity. Little can be done to increase capacity. Provision of jobs is difficult, infrastructure upgrades are risky. Loss of countryside for a town which is already impacted by the A120.	
	666		Mr Roger Lawrence	Question not answered	Question not answered	Question not answered				Question not answered	OS - Object to West of Braintree due to traffic and water supply. Build small number of houses over each parish instead.	
		LPPD27	Mr Andrew Hunter, Planning Advisor - Sustainable Places Team Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	No	✓				OFFICER RESPONSE Support reference to provision of improvements to waste water treatments however it requires amendment to clearly signpost the IDP. We have been working with AECOM and Anglian Water on the preparation of an Integrated Water Management Strategy (IWMS) for the Garden Communities. A draft IWMS stage 2 report is expected to be made available to us and AW August 2017. Stage 1 IWMS highlighted that the scale and location of development across the Garden Communities poses significant challenges around provision of water supply, wastewater services and management of flood risk and that the final garden communities does not have identified solutions. IWMS Stage 2 will develop a range of delivery option strategies based on a series of potential measures. IWMS Stage 2, and where considered necessary, an IWMS Stage 3 should provide the necessary evidence to support the development of the respective garden communities without impacting on the environment.	Item 17 should be re-worded along the following lines: Provision of improvements, ahead of development, to waste water treatment including an upgrade to the Colchester Waste Water Treatment Plan in accordance with the programme set out in the Braintree Infrastructure Delivery Plan and off-site drainage improvements. The purpose here is to set out a clear signposting of infrastructure delivery requirements as evaluated under the BIDP. It should be noted that the priority for this infrastructure type is described as critical under Table 13.1, which is presumably a reflection of its importance. We understand the Braintree Infrastructure Delivery Plan has already been published and whilst it does show a programme for water infrastructure, this appears to have been based on the water cycle studies carried out at the individual local planning authority level. Given this, it might be preferable for a standalone detailed IWMS delivery plan for the preferred strategy for the Garden Communities to be provided for evidence purposes in support of the water infrastructure requirements for Section 1 of the Local Plan.

		LPPD40	Historic Environment Planning Adviser, Historic England	Yes	Yes	No	✓	✓	✓			Officer summary - Proposed garden community could have significant impact on setting of listed buildings and Registered Park and Garden at Saling Grove. Part F (para 20) should be strengthened and amended to include reference to the heritage assets and the need to have regard to their setting when preparing more detailed planning frameworks for the site. No indication as to how the extent of the garden communities will be determined. Include an additional criterion in Policy SP10, to define appropriate safeguarding buffers around heritage assets.	Include an additional criterion in Policy SP10, to define appropriate safeguarding buffers around heritage assets such as registered parks and gardens, scheduled monuments, conservation areas and listed buildings and identify how the historic environment and heritage assets can form part of the development of successful schemes.
		LPPD47	Mr Mark Behrendt	Yes	Yes	No				✓		In SP7 the absolute target of 30% is clearly set out in part v. However, in Policy SP8 and Policy SP9 these targets are set out as minimums. An essential part of the local plan is to provide certainty to the applicants and to decision makers with regard to new development. Placing a minimum on the affordable housing requirement suggests that a higher proportion may be applicable and is purely a starting point for negotiation. The local plan must be clear as to the target it is seeking in order provide a clear pricing signal to the market. This can then be factored into the price of land by developers when seeking to acquire land in these areas. To make these policies sound the affordable housing requirement in SP8, SP9 and SP10 should not be set as minimums.	To make these policies sound the affordable housing requirement in SP8, SP9 and SP10 should not be set as minimums.
		LPPD69	Mr David Moseley, Strategic Planner Persimmon Homes	Yes	Yes	Yes						[Officer summary] Persimmon Homes object to the affordable housing target of 30%(set out in Policies SP8, 9 and 10) being a"minimum". The Local Plan must set out clearly the target it is seeking to achieve and, in line with Para 173 of the NPPF, assess the implications for development viability having regard to the scale of obligations and policy burdens of the development plan as a whole. It is considered that an uncapped target does not provide certainty and could place a policy burden that would threaten viability. The market and purchasing decisions factor in policy requirements and not having clarity would give rise to significant uncertainty that would not assist delivery.	[Officer interpretation] Do not require 30% affordable housing as a minimum in Policies SP8, 9 or 10.
		LPPD104	Matthew Parsons, Persimmon Homes	Yes	Yes	Yes						[Officer summary] Persimmon Homes object to the affordable housing target of 30%(set out in Policies SP8, 9 and 10) being a"minimum". The Local Plan must set out clearly the target it is seeking to achieve and, in line with Para 173 of the NPPF, assess the implications for development viability having regard to the scale of obligations and policy burdens of the development plan as a whole. It is considered that an uncapped target does not provide certainty and could place a policy burden that would threaten viability. The market and purchasing decisions factor in policy requirements and not having clarity would give rise to significant uncertainty that would not assist delivery.	[Officer interpretation] Do not require 30% affordable housing as a minimum in Policies SP8, 9 or 10.

**LPA Response:**

A number of the representations for this policy raised similar points and these are set out below with details of the Councils response. The list of proposed minor modifications includes suggested clarification on wording related to transport, health and water. Apart from minor modifications, no other changes are considered necessary to Policy SP10.

Duty to Co-operate - Concerns have been raised about the co-operation between UDC and BDC. UDC have confirmed that the Duty to Co-operate has been met between the two authorities with regards to this community and other cross boundary strategic issues. A statement of common ground will also shortly be submitted between the two authorities. the Local Plans are at different stages, but the Councils have worked together to ensure the most comprehensive picture is available to the public at each time. This includes attending each others consultation events. An Issues and Options DPD for West of Braintree produced jointly by BDC and UDC will be subject to consultation in the next two months.

Brownfield Land - Responses have suggested that there is suitable brownfield sites have not been considered. This is not the case, the availability of brownfield land has been considered as part of the Local Plan through the SHLAA process. Suitable brownfield sites will not deliver the number of homes needed to meet the identified housing need.

Transport Infrastructure - Respondents raise questions a number of questions on transport infrastructure. One is in relation to the connections to the strategic road network. At present the junction to the A120 is not all movements, however this will be improved to an all movements junction as part of the new development. There is concern that the local road network would be over whelmed by the development. The access and movement strategy as part of the evidence base sets out how a range of measures could be put in place to ensure that the existing road network is not overwhelmed. Finally in relation to the rail network and public transport provision, it is recognised of course that the current provision in the area is limited, due to its limited population. The Garden Community is committed to delivering a step change in public transport provision and this commitment is set out within the evidence base.

Infrastructure - As well as road infrastructure there is also a concern from residents regarding the ability of other infrastructure to deal with the development. The Councils are working with the bodies responsible for providing these services to ensure that they can be provided on the development at the same time as the housing development. This includes education, with early years, primary and secondary all being provided on the site and primary health care facilities which will also be provided for on site. There will be a whole range of community, social and leisure facilities provided on the site and contributions made to off site facilities which will be of benefit to new and existing residents. The benefit of the garden community approach means in terms of scale and delivery model, infrastructure improvements can be achieved.

Natural Environment - A number of comments specifically reference features in the garden community area of search such as Boxted Wood. As a protected ancient woodland, this alongside other woodlands in the garden community will be protected and form part of the green infrastructure for the garden community which will add many new areas of publically accessible open space and areas of high biodiversity content to the area. This will be set out in detail through the DPD process and work with Natural England. The garden community will apply with all national and european guidance in relation to this area

Mineral Safeguarding - The garden community area of search includes an area to the south which has been identified within the Essex County Council Minerals Plan as a sand and gravel mineral extraction site and is subject to a current planning application. A detailed phasing plan will be developed as part of the DPD which sets out the areas of first development that can take place whilst extraction continues. A minerals resource assessment will also need to be undertaken as part of this work

Existing Communities - The Councils note and understand the concerns of the existing communities regarding the proposed garden community, which will undoubtedly change the character of the local area. Extensive open space between the new and existing communities will be put in place and strategies to ensure that local facilities or local road networks will not be overwhelmed. The garden community is also an opportunity and is expected to deliver new public transport routes which will link with the existing communities and to deliver substantial new community facilities and infrastructure which will be for the benefit of all residents, new and existing.

Affordable Housing - The Councils will be taking an active role in the development of these sites and will look to deliver a minimum of 30% affordable housing through various means. The Garden Communities are not being delivered by the private sector in isolation. The target to achieve a minimum of 30% is therefore appropriate. The DPD will provide more detail.

CBC rep ID	BDC rep ID	TDC rep ID	Name, Organisation		Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/ written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan
				Legally compliant										
<b>Delivery, Implementation and Monitoring Arrangements</b>														
6111			Richard Waylen										Consideration of other agencies in delivering the plan, Essex County Council / Highways England for roads, Network Rail / greater Anglia for improved railways. NHS England to ensure sufficient hospital beds are provided (currently not sufficient for population)	None
7067			Essex Wildlife Trust	yes	yes	yes					w		Para. 9.4 Table1 Monitoring Requirements Under the heading: Key Indicators in Authority Monitoring Reports: Identify and monitor progress of strategic infrastructure projects  This will need to include surveys and monitoring of wildlife habitat condition and key species as indicators of biodiversity health.	None
	33		mr wesley dearsley	No	No	No		✓	✓		No		Education/Healthcare are not factored into decision making, the priority appears to be on housing and not connecting the need for extending facilities to cope with the additional volume of people.	

	68	Mr John August Galliard Homes Ltd Agent: Mr Martin Herbert WYG	Yes		Yes					Yes	In paragraph 9.2 the Council mentions it will explore 'other models of delivery'. Galliard Homes supports this approach as the most important objective is, as the Council suggests, the 'quality and timing of outcomes for the community as a whole'. The objective is not to pursue one particular delivery method but to agree on the most effective means of delivering the community to meet the aspirations of all the stakeholders. This is likely to require a flexible approach and to recognise the various strengths of the public and private sector and how they are employed to best effect.	
	74	Mrs Anne Aggiss	No	No	No					No	There has been no proper visible cross boundary collaboration with neighbours and communities. to win hearts and minds. The fact that UDC are only just embarking on their first DLPC is evidence that their is no close collaboration.	
	169	Mrs Jacqueline Kingdom	No	No	No				✓	Yes	If any cross border consultation has taken place with Uttlesford DC, it has been in private. There has been no opportunity for the public to comment, nor contribute to any discussion.	
	217	Mr Peter Williams Director Williams Group Agent: Mrs Teresa Cook Principal Consultant Emery Planning Partnership Ltd	Yes	Yes	No				✓	Yes	The plan underplays the delivery of housing. Much greater attention needs to be given to the early delivery phases (especially in the first 5 years) and in meeting unmet need from recent years. In the longer term too much reliance is given to the garden communities, which are little more than a concept at this stage. Their theoretical capacity should be reduced in the plans housing trajectory.	The number of homes stated to be delivered in Braintree District at the West of Braintree Garden Community site during the plan period should be reduced in line with the review of delivery rates as described in our response to Policy SP2. The number of homes stated to be delivered in Braintree District at the Colchester/Braintree Borders Garden Community site during the plan period should be reduced in line with the review of delivery rates as described in our response to Policy SP2.

**LPA Response:** The Councils consider that the Duty to Cooperate with other authorities has been addressed, as documented in the Duty to Cooperate Statement. The Councils will assure regular monitoring of the plan, in line with national requirements. Detail on delivery of Garden Communities to be provided in the Development Plan Documents under development. No changes are deemed necessary to this section.

## Section 1 Sustainability Appraisal representations

Name, Organisation	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan
Gladman Developments	Although the quantity of sites assessed for garden communities is deemed acceptable, the sites election has been artificially suppressed by the 5000 dwelling threshold that has been applied. There is overwhelming evidence that this has resulted in a narrow focus being applied to the consideration of the new garden community options.	

Historic England	We disagree with the assessment on page 33 that overall there will be positive impacts. As document in this rep and previous responses the information provided on the garden communities has not been sufficient for us to establish the potential impact on heritage assets or any potential opportunities for enhancement. Annex A did not reference and review a number of pieces of legislation, policy and supporting information we would expect to see in a review. Section 7.2 on listed buildings omits consideration of buildings of local importance and is primarily concerned with heritage at risk. Section 7.3 is extremely brief. Section 7.4 should be amended to Historic England. The information on Parks and Gardens is inconsistent between the three districts. It does not include a reference to the ECC list of Historic Parks and Gardens.	
Natural England	We note the additions made to the SA following our previous advice and have no further comments.	
Lightwood Strategic	The SA is deficient in its assessment of reasonable alternative overall strategies.	

**LPA Reponse:** The SA was prepared in accordance with legislation and best practice. The SA has informed the preparation of the Local Plan and has been subject to consultation at every stage. Whilst Historic England disagrees with the positive scoring for the historic environment, this has been justified in the appraisal. The baseline environment and review of policies, plans and programmes are both detailed and have been ongoing since work began on the SA in 2014.