



Tendring **District Council**



Tendring District Local Plan Consultation Statement

October 2017

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Legislation and requirements	4
3. Bodies and persons invited to make reps under regulation 18	5
4. How bodies and persons were invited to make reps under regulation 18	8
5. Summary of main issues raised in regulation 18 reps	10
6. How regulation 18 reps were taken into account	20
7. Regulation 20 reps - main issues	22

Appendix 1: List of consultees

Appendix 2: Letters and emails

Appendix 3: Leaflets

Appendix 4: Press releases and newspaper ads

Appendix 5: Report to Local Plan Committee 12 November 2015

Appendix 6: Report to Local Plan Committee 3 November 2016

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Tendring District Council (TDC) has prepared a Local Plan to guide development up to 2033. The Local Plan comprises two sections. Section 1 was prepared in partnership with Braintree District Council and Colchester Borough Council (the North Essex authorities) and plans for the creation of three garden communities across North Essex, which will include longer term development beyond the plan period. Section 2 is unique to Tendring and includes allocations and policies to guide development in the Tendring District up to 2033.
- 1.2 The timetable for the Local Plan production, as set out in the Local Development Scheme, has been as follows:
 - Issues and Options consultation (Regulation 18) - 1 September - 13 October 2015
 - Preferred Options consultation (Regulation 18) – 14 July - 8 September 2016
 - Publication Draft consultation (Regulation 19) – 16 June – 28 July 2017
 - Submission to Secretary of State (Regulation 22) October 2017
- 1.3 This Consultation Statement accompanies the submission documents for examination.
- 1.4 Regulation 18(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 provides that a local planning authority must invite consultees to 'make representations to the local planning authority about what a local plan...ought to contain', and that the local authority should then take account of these views when developing its plan. Accordingly an Issues and Options document seeking views on what the new Local Plan ought to contain was published for public consultation from 1 September to 13 October 2015. At the same time, landowners and developers were invited to put forward potential development sites ('call for sites').
- 1.5 The Issues and Options document provided background on the plan-making process and then posed a series of open-ended questions on key issues and high level options for growth. The document made it clear that the local planning authority was at the initial stages of considering policy and site allocation options. It also made clear that it was open to suggestions from all respondents on how the Local Plan can best be revised to meet the needs of a growing population, changing social and economic circumstances, and evolving national policies.
- 1.6 Following the Issues and Options consultation the local planning authority considered all representations (610), which are summarised in this Statement, the evidence base, national policy, and began the process of drafting the Preferred Options Local Plan.
- 1.7 The Preferred Options Local Plan was published for consultation from 14 July to 8 September 2016. 1,537 representations were received on numerous aspects of the Preferred Options Local Plan. Following consideration of all representations received and further evidence the LPA amended the Preferred Options draft and the Council approved the Publication Draft Local Plan for consultation on June 2017. The Publication Draft Local Plan was published for consultation from 16 June to 28 July 2017.

2. Legislation and requirements

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

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

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

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

* The Consultation Statement must set out:

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

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

3. Bodies and persons invited to make reps under regulation 18

3.1 The local planning authority maintains a Planning Policy consultations database, which currently contains 1,771 consultees. All of these consultees were informed of each of the stages of consultation and invited to make representations. A list of organisations on the LPAs consultation database is included in appendix 1. Please note that the individuals on this database have not been listed in the appendix.

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

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

'**specific consultation bodies**' means:

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

(bb) who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority,

(x) if it exercises functions in any part of the local planning authority's area

(aa) a Strategic Health Authority,

(bb) a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) or (c) of the Electricity Act 1989,

(cc) a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986,

(dd) a sewerage undertaker,

(ee) a water undertaker;

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

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

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

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

(a) The Environment Agency;

(b) The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as Historic England);

(c) Natural England;

(d) The Mayor of London;

(e) The Civil Aviation Authority;

(f) The Homes and Communities Agency;

(g) Each Primary Care Trust established under section 18 of the National Health Service Act 2006 or continued in existence by virtue of that section (now Clinical Commissioning Groups);

(h) The Office of Rail Regulations;

(i) Transport for London;

(j) Each Integrated Transport Authority;

(k) Each highway authority within the meaning of section 1 of the Highways Act 1980 (including the Secretary of State, where the Secretary of State is the highways authority); and

(l) The Marine Management Organisation.

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

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

3.6 The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 Regulation 4(1) identifies the following consultation bodies under the Regulations:

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

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

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

4.1 The LPA carried out two periods of consultation under regulation 18. The Issues and Options consultation took place between 1 September and 13 October 2015. The Preferred Options consultation took place between 14 July and 8 September 2016.

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

Letters and emails

4.3 The LPA emailed all consultees on the Planning Policy consultation database. These consultees included all of the groups/ people referred to in section (i). Letters were sent to those without an email address. Examples of the emails and letters sent out are attached as appendix 2 to this statement.

Public exhibitions

4.4 As part of both consultations exhibitions were held at various locations throughout the District. These exhibitions provided consultees the opportunity to discuss the emerging Local Plan with Planning Officers and also seek support on how to make a representation. Attendees were provided with background information on the Local Plan process; opportunities to ask questions of the officers in attendance; the chance to leave initial thoughts on post-it notes; and information on how to respond more formally to the consultation.

4.5 The following exhibitions were held as part of the Issues and Options consultation:

Date	Time	Location
5 September 2015	10am-3pm	Pier Avenue Baptist Church, Clacton
7 September 2015	10am-9pm	Council Chamber, Weeley
14 September 2015	3pm-7.30pm	Park Pavilion, Dovercourt
15 September 2015	4pm-7pm	The Venture Centre, Lawford
17 September 2015	10am-4pm	The Council House, Triangle Shopping Centre, Frinton
19 September 2015	12.30pm-4.30pm	Tendring Enterprise Studio School, Jaywick Lane, Clacton
23 September 2015	5.30pm-8.30pm	Great Bromley Village Hall

4.6 There was also a public meeting, hosted by Ramsey Parish Council, at Ramsey Village Hall on 7 October 2015.

4.7 An estimated 930 people attended the above events.

4.8 The following exhibitions were held as part of the Preferred Options consultation:

Date	Time	Location
18 July 2016	3pm-7.30pm	Clacton Town Hall
20 July 2016	3pm-8pm	Baker Hall, Kirby Cross
3 August 2016	9.630am-1.30pm	Council Chamber, Weeley
4 August 2016	2.30pm-7pm	Columbine Centre, Walton
13 August 2016	10.30am-2.30pm	Tendring Enterprise Studio School, Jaywick Lane, Clacton
16 August 2016	3pm-7.30pm	Central Church, Dovercourt
19 August 2016	3pm-7.30pm	Council Chamber, Weeley
22 August 2016	1.30pm-6.30pm	The Venture Centre, Lawford
30 August 2016	2.30pm-6.30pm	Elmstead Market Community Centre

4.9 An estimated 815 people attended the above events.

Leaflets

4.10 Leaflets were circulated to every household in the district to make residents (and others) aware of the above consultation events as part of both the Issues and Options and Preferred Options consultations. Copies of these were taken to the exhibitions, sent to Town/Parish Councils and deposited in Tendring's libraries. Copies of the leaflets for both consultations are attached in appendix 3 to this statement.

Press releases

4.11 Press releases were also prepared for the Issues and Options and Preferred Options consultation exercises. These are attached at appendix 4 to this statement.

5. Summary of main issues raised in regulation 18 reps

5.1 A summary of the main issues raised in the representations made pursuant to the Issues and Options and Preferred Options consultations (Regulation 18) is set out in this chapter along with some commentary on how these issues have been taken into account in progressing to publication stage. The main issues identified by the Council are:

Issue 1: Objectively Assessed Housing Needs

Issue 2: Colchester Tendring Borders Garden Community

Issue 3: Development at Weeley

Issue 4: Development at Tendring Central (Frating/Great Bromley)

Issue 5: Development at Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley

Issue 6: Developments in rural areas

Issue 7: Development of an alternative new settlement

Issue 8: Alternative third-party site submissions

Issue 9: Sustainability Appraisal

Issue 10: Flood risk/sequential testing

Issue 11: Ecology/Habitat Regulations

Issue 12: Traffic, congestion and highways

Issue 13: Heath provision

Issue 14: Education provision

Issue 15: Employment provision

Issue 16: Local Green Gap and Coastal Protection Belt Policies

Issue 17: Housing Policies

5.2 A full report of representations received in response to the Issues and Options and Preferred Options Stages, as presented to TDC's Local Plan Committee on 12 November 2015 and 3 November 2016 are attached at Appendices 5 and 6.

Issue 1: Objectively Assessed Housing Needs

At Issues & Options stage, Chelmsford City Council, Braintree District Council, Colchester Borough Council and Essex County Council initially raised concern that TDC had selected the lower figure of 597 dwellings per annum within a range recommended by Peter Brett Associates in the 2015 joint Objectively Assessed Housing Needs Study whilst other authorities in the housing market area were adopting the higher figures within the range (which for Tendring would be 705). Objections were also made by a number of landowners

and developers who considered that the Council should be adopting a higher figure and that additional land allocations would need to be made to address this requirement.

Representations from many community representatives (including local Councillors, Town and Parish Councils and other community groups) and members of the public however suggested that the figure should be lower with some suggestions that the calculations in the OAHN study were flawed and that the district would not be able to accommodate the levels of growth with concerns mainly in respect of health and education provision, traffic and congestion, and environmental impacts including the loss of agricultural land.

The OAHN study was updated twice in 2016, initially recommending a range of 550 to 600 dwellings per annum which was reflected in the two options in the preferred options draft and then more specifically recommending 550 dwellings per annum which forms the basis of the housing requirement in the publication draft. At preferred options stage, Chelmsford, Braintree, Colchester and Essex Councils supported the Council's approach but objections from landowners and developers and from communities and residents remained – arguing either for a higher figure and the inclusion of additional sites, or for a lower figure and the deletion of sites (particularly at Weeley)..

At publication stage, there are fewer objections to the OAHN figure of 550 dwellings per annum, partly as a result of a number of major housing sites gaining planning permission in advance of publication – thus resulting in site promoters and members of the public no longer seeing the need to object to the Local Plan.

That said, OAHN continues to remain one of the main issues raised by objectors to the plan at publication stage with mainly landowners and developers suggesting that the figure needs to increase to reflect, amongst other things, DCLG household projections, market signals and migration out of London. The Council will however be defending its decision to use the figure of 550 dwellings per annum, or 11,000 homes over the plan period.

Issue 2: Colchester Tendring Borders Garden Community

At issues and options stage, the concept of for major growth to the east of Colchester and to the west of Tendring was a feature of all the 4 options included in the consultation document, in recognition of the need for the two authorities to work together to meet future housing needs in a sustainable manner and to foster economic growth in and around the University of Essex. Whilst Colchester Borough Council initially raised concern about the way in which the option was presented, favouring a more collaborative approach, the concept was supported and has been developed up in more detail through Section 1 of the Local Plan, prepared jointly through preferred options and publication stage.

The proposal attracted a fairly high level of objection at issues and options and preferred options stage mainly from residents in Elmstead Market and the wider area concerned about its impacts on infrastructure and the environment, and from those concerned about the impact of development on the ecological and landscape value of Salary Brook.

Whilst supported by the landowners and developers likely to benefit from the proposal, the garden community has raised concern amongst landowners and developers promoting alternative sites in the district. Whilst there is general support for the concept, there is suggestion that it will take longer to implement than the Council expects and that there

should be no or reduced reliance on house completions in this area in the plan period and that other sites, with shorter timeframes for delivery, should be included in the plan.

There has also been concern raised about the definition of boundaries for the garden community to give certainty as to the extent of development and its likely impacts.

As the Councils progress to publication stage, work has begun on the preparation of a more detailed Development Plan Document (DPD) for the Colchester Tendring borders Garden Community which provide greater clarity on the scale and nature of the development and help to underpin the Councils' assumptions about housing delivery.

Issue 3: Development at Weeley

At issues and options stage, one of the four spatial options (Option 2) involved a concentration of growth around Weeley due to its strategic location in the centre of the district and its good transport links. Even before the issues and option document was published, this concept (whilst being considered by the Local Plan Committee) attracted a 700 name petition from residents concerned about the impact on the character of the village and local infrastructure. This translated into a high level of objection to the proposal during the formal consultation.

Weeley Parish Council objected to the option on the basis that it did not reflect the recommendations of TDC's Economic Development Strategy (which advocated growth around Clacton, Colchester and Harwich), there was no GP surgery in Weeley and only a small percentage of commuters use the railway. Frating and Manningtree were highlighted as preferable locations for growth.

Essex County Council advised that Option 2 was sustainable from a primary school perspective but would only from a secondary school perspective if the railway was used to transport pupils to and from the Frinton campus of the Tendring Technology College. Natural England suggested that this option was one of the lowest carbon options.

A combination of Option 1 (Hartley Garden Suburb) (involving growth around north-west Clacton) and Option 2 (Weeley Garden Village) was carried forward into the preferred options consultation draft after it was concluded that Option 3 (Tendring Central Garden Village) was the least sustainable and that Option 4 (Higher Urban Densities) was undesirable from a built-form and social perspective. At that time, the Objectively Assessed Housing Need was still to be determined and so the plan included two further options – one for 550 dwellings per annum proposing just 304 dwellings at Weeley in the plan period, and one for 600 dwellings per annum proposing 1,411 dwellings at Weeley in the plan period. .

The latter option attracted a considerable level of public objection, some three quarters of all public representations. The most common concerns were the rural environment and the history of the village, as well as impacts on infrastructure. There was a strong local campaign against the developments at Weeley with a focus on the percentage increase in dwellings for the village.

On settling the OAHN at 550 dwellings per annum following the November 2016 update to the OAHN study, it was decided that the lower growth option for Weeley, including just 304 dwellings would proceed to publication stage and that the developments proposed for land

to the west and to the north of the village be deleted. The overall level of objection to development at Weeley at publication stage has reduced substantially, but it still remains the most contentious issue amongst Tendring's public with residents still objecting to the scale of the development proposed as well as the Council's choice of land to the east of the village. The Council will be defending its allocation as being necessary to contribute towards meeting housing needs in the district.

Neither the land allocated for development to the east or north of the village are subject of representations at publication stage which might indicate that the respective landowners are no longer perusing their proposals for this plan period. However, part of the land east of the village has been the subject of an outline planning application 16/02131/OUT for 228 dwellings, primary school, nursery and car park which was refused by the Council in April 2016 and could still be the subject of a planning appeal. An alternative proposal from Taylor Wimpey for development on land to the north-west of the village, north of Colchester Road, is however the subject of representations at publication stage and too was the subject of a planning application 16/01847/OUT for up to 380 dwellings with employment land and a primary school. Again this proposal was refused by the Council in April 2017 and could still be the subject of a planning appeal.

Issue 4: Development at Tendring Central (Frating/Great Bromley)

At issues and options stage, one of the four spatial options (Option 3) involved a concentration of growth around Frating and Great Bromley in recognition of its strategic location in the centre of the district on the strategic road network at the A120/A133 interchange. This option attracted a significant level of public objection and was the least popular of the options presented with residents and Parish Councils concerned about the coalescence and loss of character of a number of smaller rural settlements. There was however some support for the proposal from people from and those representing Weeley and the coastal towns, suggesting that this location was better for job creation and commuting. Essex County Council identified Option 3 (Tendring Central Garden Village) as the least sustainable option in terms of public transport, road infrastructure requirements and viability.

This option was not carried forward into the preferred options draft. Whilst the concept of growth at Tendring Central was being actively promoted by a consortium of landowners in the run-up to issues and options and at the issues and options and preferred options stages, it is not the subject of a representation at the publication stage which would indicate that the project is no longer being pursued for this plan period.

Issue 5: Development at Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley

At issues and options stage, Babergh District Council and Suffolk County Council as well as the relevant Town and Parish Councils and local residents raised concern about cumulative impacts of development in the Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley area on the highway network and the potential effects on the deliverability of the Brantham regeneration project already included in the adopted Babergh Local Plan. This issue has since been resolved through active cooperation between TDC, Babergh District Council, Essex County Council

and Suffolk County Council in the determination of major planning applications in the area. S106 legal agreements have been secured for the major developments in the area which provide financial contributions towards traffic calming measures at the Manningtree crossing. Babergh District Council and Suffolk County Council are longer objectors at publication stage.

The following proposals now all have the benefit of planning permission in the Manningtree, Lawford, Mistley and Brantham areas totalling some 1,436 dwellings:

- B/15/00263 - Brantham Industrial Estate, Factory Lane, Brantham, Suffolk: 320 dwellings and 55,000 sqm of commercial floor space.
- 15/00876/OUT – Land East of Bromley Road, Lawford, Essex: 360 dwellings and community facilities.
- 15/00761/OUT – Land South of Long Road and West of Clacton Road, Mistley, Essex: 300 dwellings and 2 hectares of employment land.
- 14/01050/DETAIL – Land at Dale Hall, Coxs Hill, Lawford, Essex (Summers Park): 150 dwellings and 700 sqm of business use (under construction).
- 15/01520/OUT – Land South of Harwich Road, Mistley, Essex: 135 dwellings including flexible building and allotments.
- 15/01810/OUT – Land North of Stourview Avenue, Mistley, Essex: 70 dwellings.
- 12/00427/FUL – Thorn Quay Warehouse, High Street, Mistley, Essex: 45 dwellings, quay level warehouse floorspace, office floorspace and car parking provision.
- 12/00109/FUL – Crown Building, Former Secret Bunker, Shrubland Road, Mistley, Essex: 31 dwellings (under construction).
- 15/01787/FUL - Site to South of Pound Corner, Harwich Road, Mistley, Essex: 25 dwellings.

The applications at Brantham Industrial Estate, Bromley Road and Long Road/Clacton Road will contribute, through s106, to the improvements required at the crossing thus addressing the main issue of concern raised by neighbouring authorities and local residents.

The settlement development boundaries in the preferred options and publication drafts were amended to reflect the various grants of planning permission and development in the area is no longer the subject of such large numbers of objections. There are also no longer any objections to the publication draft from Babergh District Council or Suffolk County Council following the resolution of these issues through effective cooperation.

Issue 6: Developments in rural areas

At issues and options and preferred options stages, there was major concern expressed by residents and community representatives in the district's rural areas about the impact of

housing development on the limited services and facilities available in their villages and on the rural character of those places.

The concerns heightened at preferred options stage when the Council was dealing with a very large number of speculative planning applications for housing around larger villages including Alresford, Great Bentley, Elmstead Market, Little Clacton and Thorpe le Soken. Many of these applications went on to gain planning permission, either from the Council or on appeal, because TDC was unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites and therefore the government's 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' was engaged.

Whilst many residents are aggrieved at the development allowed around their villages, they will contribute towards meeting objectively assessed housing needs in the plan period and, at publication stage, most community representatives are supportive of the Local Plan as they understand that a lack of an up to date Local Plan can lead to speculative and unwanted development proposals taking place in their areas.

Issue 7: Development of an alternative new settlement

At issues and options stage, there were suggestions mainly from some residents and Town and Parish Councils that an alternative location for a new settlement, other than Weeley or Frating, should be explored. The main suggestion was land at Horsley Cross which is well located for the A120, does not impact upon existing communities and residents and some land benefits from outline permission for a business park. The option was not included in the issues and options consultation as the land is considered to be too remote to offer a sustainable location for major development, there was limited interest from landowners or the development industry to bring such a proposal forward and the proposal was unlikely to be deliverable within the plan period. Development at Horsley Cross is not the subject of a representation from businesses, landowners or developments at publication stage which would indicate no interest in proceeding with such a project.

Issue 8: Alternative third-party site submissions

At issues and options stage, TDC invited stakeholders to put forward proposals as part of a 'call for sites' exercise. Around 50 of the representations from businesses, landowners and developers were therefore seeking the inclusion of land within the Local Plan for either housing, commercial or mixed-use development. The majority of these representations were from landowners and developers proposing sites which they consider could accommodate between 40 – 250 dwellings. A smaller number suggested revisions to settlement development boundaries, particularly in rural areas, to enable smaller residential developments to take place. There were also representations from developers and landowners promoting much larger, mixed use, development proposals for Weeley in line with Option 2, Frating in line with Option 3 and on land to the east of Colchester.

Since the Issues and Options stage, a significant number of the larger sites that were being promoted for inclusion in the Local Plan for housing have obtained planning permission either from the Council or on appeal – mainly around Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley and some of the district's rural villages.

The most notable examples include:

- Land east of Halstead Road, Kirby Cross (15/01234/OUT) for up to 240 dwellings;
- Land at Turpins Farm, Frinton (16/00031/OUT) for up to 210 dwellings;
- Land r/o 121-1383 Thorpe Road, Kirby Cross (15/01710/OUT) for up to 109 dwellings;
- Land at Bromley Road, Lawford (15/00876/OUT) for up to 360 dwellings;
- Land at Long Road/Clacton Road, Mistley (15/00761/OUT) for up to 300 dwellings;
- Land at Harwich Road, Mistley (15/01520/OUT) for up to 135 dwellings;
- Land at Stourview Avenue, Mistley (15/01810/OUT) for up to 70 dwellings;
- Land south of Cockaynes Lane, Alresford (14/01823/OUT) for up to 145 dwellings;
- Land north of Cockaynes Lane, Alresford (15/00120/OUT) for up to 60 dwellings;
- Land at St. Andrew's Road, Alresford (15/01277/OUT) for 45 dwellings;
- Land at Charity Field, Elmstead Market (14/01728/OUT) for up to 50 dwellings;
- Land at Clacton Road, Elmstead Market (16/01994/DETAIL) for 32 dwellings;
- Land west of the Street, Little Clacton (15/01550/OUT) for up to 98 dwellings; and
- Land at Landemere Road, Thorpe le Soken (16/01169/OUT) for up to 98 dwellings.

The 50 sites submitted by landowners and developers for consideration as part of the Local Plan have been considered by the Council both through its Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) and through the determination of planning applications and appeals.

Sites that remain the subject of representations at preferred options and publication stages were and are generally being promoted with the argument that the objectively assessed housing need should be higher than 550 dwellings per annum and/or that sites allocated in the plan (particularly the Colchester Tendring Borders Garden Community) are unlikely to deliver within the plan period.

Issue 9: Sustainability Appraisal

At issues and options stage, Essex County Council highlighted the fact that the Council had yet to produce a Sustainability Appraisal and that this would need to be undertaken for each stage of plan preparation to inform the decision making process and to comply with the legal requirements of the planning system. TDC has now ensured that this issue has been resolved and Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment has been undertaken for all stages of the process. There are a small number of objections to the SA/SEA which will be considered as part of the examination process.

Issue 10: Flood risk/sequential testing

At issues and options stage, the Environment Agency rightly advised the Council to undertake a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to guide the pattern of growth in the district which would need to include sequential testing of sites in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This work has been undertaken, it forms part of the evidence base and at publication stage the comments of the Environment Agency are mainly

constructive suggestions for the working of text and policies, with no objections to any specific proposals.

Issue 11: Ecology/Habitat Regulations

At issues and option stage, Natural England, RSPB and Essex Wildlife Trust highlighted the importance of complying with the European Habitat Regulations and ensuring that the ecological impacts of proposals in the plan are properly considered – particularly as Tendring is home not a number of internationally important wildlife designations. Habitat Regulation Assessment has been undertaken for the Local Plan and is part of the evidence base.

Issue 12: Traffic, congestion and highways

A big concern locally, as expressed in representations from residents and community representatives at issues and options and preferred options stages, is the impact of additional housing and employment on the road network, and in particular sections of the network that already suffer from congestion. In response to these concerns, Essex County Council has worked with TDC to undertake transport modelling for the Local Plan which identifies the capacity of key road junctions in the district and the mitigation measures required to increase capacity in the future, for which a combination of developer contributions and public funding will be needed to implement. The proposals include alterations to the roundabouts on the A133 at Frating and Weeley which are most affected by congestion. There have subsequently been no objections to the plan from Highways England nor Essex County Council as the local highway authority.

Issue 13: Health provision

Another issue of local concern amongst residents and community representatives has been health provision and the potential pressure that additional households will place on local surgeries and hospitals. This is a particular concern in the Tendring area (Clacton and Frinton in particular) where there is an ageing population with complex health needs and difficulty in recruiting health professionals. NHS England has been a partner in the preparation of the Local Plan and, aware of the growth proposed to meet objectively assessed needs, is working on a strategy for the delivery of health care in the district and, more widely, in North Essex. NHS England supports the Local Plan but reserves the right to advise on the best way for health provision to be delivered – seeking mainly to maximise the use of existing assets as opposed to building lots of new surgeries. NHS England have had an input into the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which forms part of the evidence base.

Issue 14: Education provision

Residents and community representatives have raised major concerns about the impact of additional growth on school places in the district and Essex County Council, in its capacity as the local education authority, has been advising TDC on how best to ensure the educational needs of the growing population can be met. For many of the major developments that have already obtained planning permission for residential development,

financial contributions are being secured through s106 legal agreements to enable the expansion of existing schools to meet increasing demand. At issues and options stage, Essex County Council expressed a preference for Options 1 and 4 as the most efficient ways of ensuring educational needs can be met in a sustainable way, there are subsequently no objections at publication stage from ECC on educational grounds. ECC's advice has informed the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IPD) which forms part of the evidence base and it is proposed that the larger developments allocated around Clacton and at the Colchester Tendring Borders Garden Communities will deliver new schools and early year and childcare facilities.

Issue 15: Employment provision

A big issue raised at issues and options stage was the concern that the increase in housing would not be matched with an increase in jobs and therefore growth would exacerbate deprivation rather than stimulate economic growth. This perception runs contrary to the professional advice contained within the Council's Economic Development Strategy which sees housing growth as a means of stimulating economic growth by generating expenditure in the economy and the demand for jobs – particularly in light of the district's ageing population. Option 1 in the issues and options consultation document, which has effectively been carried forward into the Local Plan, reflects the Economic Development Strategy and the policies in the plan on employment land, retail, tourism, connectivity and skills all reflect its aims, as does the proposal for a garden community, linked to the University of Essex, on the border of Colchester and Tendring.

At publication stage, there are very few objections to the plan on employment grounds apart from landowners and developers seeking mixed-used developments, including Taylor Wimpey at Weeley.

Issue 16: Local Green Gap and Coastal Protection Belt Policies

Local policies for the protection of Strategic Green Gaps and the Coastal Protection Belt are strongly supported by residents and community representatives but concern was raised at issues and options and preferred options stages about the reduction in the coverage of these designations in the emerging plan as compared to the 2007 adopted Local Plan.

TDC has needed to review the extent of these designations in order to release land for development to meet future needs whilst ensuring that remaining land continues to contribute to the function of the strategic green gap (to maintain separation between settlements) and the coastal protection belt (to protect the sensitive landscape around the coast) and some sites were granted planning permission contrary to these policies to address a shortfall in the Council's 5-year supply. Town and Parish Councils in particular were keen to ensure these designations are given as much protection as possible in the new plan.

There are however objections, in particular to the strategic green gaps, from some landowners and developers that believe they are unnecessary and run contrary to the NPPF – however there have been appeal decisions that have upheld them as being in line with its core planning principles. Some of these objections have carried forward to publication stage but the Council will be defending these designations at the examination.

Issue 17: Housing Policies

At issues and options stage, there were a number of objections from developers and landowners to some of the Council's previous policies aimed at controlling the size, type, density and quality of residential development arguing that some of the policies were too prescriptive and could make development unviable in some areas. Detailed policies have since been presented in the plan at preferred options and publication stage and the Council has produced a viability study for the Local Plan which confirms that its housing policies are viable and workable and which forms part of the evidence base. At publication stage, there remains a relatively small number of objections to these policies from landowners and developers – particularly in respect of density and the application of minimum standards.

6. How regulation 18 reps were taken into account

6.1 All valid representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account in the preparation of the Local Plan. The regulation 18 Preferred Options consultation attracted a high number of responses totalling 1,537 representations from 248 respondents. This compares to a total of approximately 610 responses from individuals and organisations at the regulation 18 Issues and Options stage in 2015.

6.2 The commentary in section 5 of this statement above explains how the key issues identified by respondents to the issues and options and preferred options stages were taken into account. The main changes to the Local Plan, as it has progressed through these stages to reach publication stage are summarised below.

Issue	Change to the plan
Issue 1: Objectively Assessed Housing Needs	OAHN study updated and plan reflects its recommendation of 550 dwellings per annum which takes into account
Issue 2: Colchester Tendring Borders Garden Community	Inclusion of specific policies in section 1 of the Local Plan that have been prepared jointly by Colchester, Braintree and Tendring Councils
Issue 3: Development at Weeley	Scale of development proposed for Weeley at preferred options stage significantly reduced following confirmation of OAHN at 550 dwellings per annum.
Issue 4: Development at Tendring Central (Frating/Great Bromley)	Option of major growth around Frating and Great Bromley rejected at preferred options stage as being the least sustainable option.
Issue 5: Development at Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley	Planning permission already granted for major developments in the area with s106 agreements to mitigate infrastructure issues. Settlement boundaries in the Local Plan drawn to reflect these consents.
Issue 6: Developments in rural areas	Planning permission already granted for major developments in rural areas (particularly larger villages) with s106 agreements to mitigate infrastructure issues. Settlement boundaries in the Local Plan drawn to reflect these consents.
Issue 7: Development of an alternative new settlement	Suggestion of alternative new settlement at Horsley Cross rejected at preferred options stage as being an undeliverable and unsustainable.
Issue 8: Alternative third-party site submissions	Many sites have now obtained planning permission or have been allocated in the Local Plan. The sites omitted from the plan are considered to be contrary to the plan's spatial

	strategy or unsuitable for other reasons.
Issue 9: Sustainability Appraisal	SA/SEA prepared for all stages of plan preparation and has informed the decision making process.
Issue 10: Flood risk/sequential testing	SFRA prepared in support of the Local Plan and developments directed towards sequentially preferable locations.
Issue 11: Ecology/Habitat Regulations	Habitats Regulation Assessment carried out for Local Plan and policies and proposals reflect its findings.
Issue 12: Traffic, congestion and highways	Transport modelling undertaken with Essex County Council which identifies capacity issues and mitigation measures on the network.
Issue 13: Health provision	Cooperation with NHS England to ensure policies are correctly worded to reflect its emerging strategy for the provision of future health care. This is reflected also in the IDP.
Issue 14: Education provision	Cooperation with Essex County Council to ensure policies and proposals deliver the increase in education provision needed. This is reflected also in the IDP.
Issue 15: Employment provision	Spatial strategy in Local Plan reflects the Economic Development Strategy and includes policies on employment land, retail, tourism, connectivity, skills and care. Joint work with Colchester, Braintree and Essex Councils to deliver new garden communities with job creation at their heart.
Issue 16: Local Green Gap and Coastal Protection Belt Policies	Retention of strategic green gaps and coastal protection belt in key locations of the district where development would lead to coalescence of settlements and/or harm to sensitive coastal landscapes.
Issue 17: Housing Policies	Viability Study undertaken to underpin the Local Plan and to confirm that policy requirements for new housing developments are viable.

7. Regulation 20 reps – main issues

7.1 In response to consultation on the publication draft in 2017, 105 representations (from 34 respondents) were made to Section 1 pursuant to regulation 20 and 511 representations (from 128 respondents) were made to Section 2 pursuant to regulation 20. This represents a significant fall in the level of objection from the preferred options stage. Below is a summary of the main issues raised in those representations.

Issue 1: Meeting Housing Needs (Policy SP3)

There are objections from a number of landowners and developments that challenge the Council's OAHN figure of 550 dwellings per annum and 11,000 homes for the plan period. The main suggestions from objectors are that the figure does not reflect the 'demographic starting point' in the official DCLG household projections and that a greater 'uplift' is required to take account of migration from London and other market signals such as affordability. The objectors to this policy are generally promoting alternative sites for inclusion in the Local Plan.

Issue 2: Colchester Tendring Borders Garden Community (Policy SP8)

Colchester Borough Council and TDC have worked together to consider objections to the garden community proposal – the majority of which were submitted to Colchester. Of those objections received by Tendring, the main concerns relate to the depiction of the garden community on the policies map without a clear indication of its boundaries, the extent to which the Council believes housing from the garden community will be deliverable within the plan period and the potential impact of the development on the environment around Salary Brook. Most of the objections to the proposal received by TDC are from landowners and developers promoting alternative sites which they believe to be more deliverable in the short to medium term.

Issue 3: Development South of Thorpe Road, Weeley (Policy SAMU5)

There remain around 30 public objections to remaining greenfield housing and mixed-use allocation on south of Thorpe Road, Weeley which is expected to deliver around 280 new homes and 1 hectare of employment land with new primary school. The objections include concerns about the impacts upon education, health, infrastructure, the local public footpath, character of the area, the proportion of the dwelling stock increase, highways, ecology, lack of employment, archaeology, the proposed footbridge, loss of views, public transport, affordable housing, surface water flooding, loss of agricultural land, the history of the area and local woodland,

Issue 4: Housing Supply and alternative third-party site submissions (Policy LP1 and relevant Policies Maps)

Around representations relate to site-specific proposals being promoted for inclusion in the Local Plan on the basis that the Council has not identified sufficient land to meet objectively assessed needs. Notable examples include:

- Land at Rush Green Road, Clacton (Bloor Homes)
- Land at Centenary Way, Clacton (Strutt and Parker)
- Land north of London Road, Clacton (MatPlan)
- Land at Sladbury's Lane and Burrs Road, Clacton (Phase 2 Planning)
- Land west of Cherry Tree Avenue, Clacton (Strutt & Parker)
- Land at Foots Farm, Clacton (Lorrimar Investments)
- Michaelstowe Farm, Dovercourt (Stanfords)
- Land at Church Hill, Ramsey (Stanfords)
- Land r/o 185 Thorpe Road, Kirby Cross (The Land and Planning Company)
- Land off Edenside/Bloomfield Avenue, Frinton (Berrys)
- Land off Trinity Road and Colchester Road, Mistley/Lawford (Stanfords)
- Land off Bromley Road, Parsons Heath, Colchester (Gladman Homes)
- Land at Brightlingsea Hall, Brightlinsea (Bidwells)
- Land off Plough Road, Great Bentley (Boyer Planning)
- Land off Wick Lane, Ardleigh (Gladman Homes)
- Several small sites around Great Holland (Stanfords)
- Land north of Colchester Road, Weeley (Taylor Wimpey)
- Land at the Lifehouse Spa, Thorpe le Soken (Collins & Coward)
- Land west of Elmstead Market (Strutt and Parker)

Issue 5: Development at EDME Maltings, Mistley (Policy SAMU1)

Strong objection from the operators of Mistley Port (Trent Wharfage Ltd or TWL) to the proposal for mixed-use development at the neighbouring Edme Maltings over concerns about its impact on their operations and on the heritage and character of the area.

Issue 6: Travellers Sites (Policy LP9)

Single objection to the policy over concerns that it will not meet the needs of gypsies and travellers, as required by national planning policy.

Issue 7: Strategic Green Gaps and Coastal Protection Belt (Policies XX and XX)

Some objections from landowners and developers to the inclusion of a strategic green gap policy in the local plan but objections also from Little Clacton Parish Council to the decrease in the size of the green gap to include additional of land off Montana Roundabout for housing. Objections also to the removal of some the designated coastal protection belt around Brightlingsea.

Issue 8: Local Impact Thresholds (for Retail) (Policy PP4)

Some suggestions that the thresholds are set too low and that policies and objectives in the Local Plan should be more positive in their support for retail and other non-B-class employment development in the Clacton area.

Appendix 1. List of consultees

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

- ADP Ltd
- Affinity Water
- Alresford Parish Council
- AM Planning
- Andrew Martin Planning
- Anglian Water
- Anglian Water Services Ltd
- Ardleigh Parish Council
- Artisan PPS Ltd
- Babergh District Council
- Barton Willmore
- Basildon Borough Council

- Bidwells
- Bilfinger GVA
- Boyer Planning
- Braintree District Council
- Brentwood Borough Council
- Brightlingsea Town Council
- British Horse Society
- British Naturalists' Association
- BT Openreach
- Cadena AM Ltd
- Campaign Against Urban Sprawl in Essex
- Carter Jonas
- Castle Point BC
- Catesby Property Group
- Chase New Homes
- Chelmsford Borough Council
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Colchester Borough Council
- Colchester Gospel Hall Trust
- Colchester Institute
- Colchester Natural History Society
- Collins and Coward
- Cushman & Wakefield
- Dovercourt Central Church
- East of England Ambulance
- Education & Skills Funding Agency
- EGA Planning
- Elmstead Parish Council
- Endeavour Group
- Environment Agency
- Epping Forest District Council

- Essex and Suffolk Water
- Essex Bridleways Association
- Essex Chambers of Commerce
- Essex County Council
- Essex Police
- Essex Wildlife Trust
- Evolution Town Planning
- Fire and Rescue Service
- Fowler Architecture and Planning Ltd (FAAP)
- Frating Parish Council
- Frinton and Walton Heritage Trust
- Frinton Residents' Association
- G and M Lord and Son
- Galliard Homes
- Gladman
- Great Bentley Parish Council
- Great Bromley Parish Council
- Great Oakley Parish Council
- Greater Anglia
- Haltermann Carless
- Hamford Water Management Committee
- Harlow Council
- Harwich Town Council
- Hawkspur Ltd
- Highways
- Hills Building Group
- Historic England
- Hollins Strategic Lane
- Holmes & Hills LLP
- Honace
- Hopkins Homes Ltd
- Indigo Planning Ltd
- JLL
- Joseph Greenhow Planning Ltd
- Kent Police and Essex Police
- Kentucky Fried Chicken (Great Britain) Ltd
- Kirby Residents Association
- Lawford Parish Council
- Leith Planning Ltd
- Lichfields
- Little Bentley Parish Council
- Little Bromley Parish Council
- Little Clacton Parish Council
- Little Dragons Pre-School
- Little Oakley Parish Council
- Local Government

- Lorrimar Investments Ltd
- LPCO
- M and M Developments Ltd
- Malborough & Co Asset Management
- Maldon District Council
- Manningtree High School Academy Trust
- Manningtree Town Council
- Marine Management Organisation
- Martin Robeson Planning Practice
- Martin Scott Properties
- MatPlan Limited
- Mayor of London
- Mersea Homes
- Mifield
- Mistley Parish Council
- Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
- National Grid
- Natural England
- NEEB Holdings
- Network Rail
- Nexus Planning Ltd
- NHS England and NEECCG and NHSPS
- Nj-landscapedesign
- North East Essex CCG
- Office of Rail Regulation
- Ontrack
- Parkeston Welfare Park and Residents Association
- Paul Hales Associates
- Persimmon Homes
- Peter Brett Associates LLP
- Phase 2 Planning & Development Ltd
- Police and Crime Commissioner for Essex
- Pomery Planning Consultancy
- Protect Great Bentley
- Ramsey & Parkeston Parish Council
- Ramsey and Parkeston PC
- Rapleys LLP
- Residents Against New Town
- Robinson & Hall LLP
- Rochford District Council
- Rose Builders
- Rose Builders Ltd
- Rosegrade Ltd
- RPS CgMs
- RSPB
- Ruston Planning Ltd

- Savills Planning
- Southend-on-Sea Council
- Sport England
- St Helena Hospice
- St Osyth Deanery
- St Osyth Parish Council
- Stanfords
- Strutt and Parker
- Strutt and Parker LLP
- Suffolk County Council
- Tendring Against Over Development
- Tendring District Council
- Tendring Parish Council
- Tetlow King Planning
- The Burghes Estate
- The Harwich Society
- The Wivenhoe Society
- Theatres Trust
- Thornpark Developments Ltd
- Thorpe Le Soken Parish Council
- Thorrington Parish Council
- Thurrock Borough Council
- Tim Snow Architects Ltd
- Town Council of Frinton and Walton
- Trinity College, Cambridge
- Troy Planning
- TW Logistics Ltd
- UK Power Networks
- University of Essex
- VRG Planning Ltd
- Weeley Parish Council
- Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP
- Wildlife Trust
- Williams Group
- Wivenhoe Neighbourhood Plan Group
- Wix Parish Council
- Woodland Trust
- Woolfbond Planning
- Wrabness Parish Council

APPENDIX 2: Letters and emails

Tendring
District Council



Tel: (01255) 686177

Fax: (01255) 686414

Email:
planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk

Website: www.tendringdc.gov.uk

19 August 2015

Our Ref: GG/Local Plan/2015

Your Ref:

Dear Sir or Madam,

The Tendring District Local Plan: Issues and Options Consultation 2015

I am writing to inform you that Tendring District Council will be undertaking six weeks public consultation on the 'Tendring District Local Plan: Issues and Options Document' starting on Tuesday 1st September 2015 and ending on Tuesday 13th October 2015. The purpose of this consultation exercise is to invite comments on what the new Local Plan for Tendring should contain (in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012). During that time, any interested party will be welcome to put forward their comments. The Issues and Options Document contains a number of questions that should help to assist people in making their comments which will be considered when the Council prepares its new Local Plan.

The new Local Plan will guide future development in the Tendring area between now and 2032. Having an up to date Local Plan is critical for creating new job opportunities, attracting investment in new and improved infrastructure, protecting the environment and ensuring that new homes are built in the right locations and achieve the right standards of quality and design. For this initial consultation exercise, we are particularly interested in people's views on the big issues facing our district and the possible options for where future housing and commercial development in Tendring should go.

The consultation documentation will be available to view at the public exhibitions listed below, in libraries throughout the district and during normal opening hours at the Weeley Council Offices and Clacton Town Hall. It will also be available to download from the Council's website **www.tendringdc.gov.uk**.

The following public exhibitions will be held during the consultation period where planning officers from the Council will be on hand to listen to any concerns or suggestions or to answer any questions people might have:

- Saturday 5th September 2015 10:00am to 3:00pm - Pier Avenue Baptist Church, Welcome Hall, Pier Avenue, Clacton;
- Monday 7th September 2015 10:00am to 9:00pm – Council Offices, Thorpe Road, Weeley;
- Monday 14th September 2015 3:00pm to 7:30pm – Park Pavilion, Barrack Lane, Harwich; and
- Saturday 19th September 2015 12:30pm to 4:30pm – Clacton Coastal Academy, Jaywick Lane, Clacton.

Your representations can be emailed to: planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk but if you do not have access to a computer, paper representations can be posted to:

Planning Policy Team

Tendring District Council

Thorpe Road

Weeley

Essex CO16 9 AJ

A representation form can be downloaded from the Council's website to assist people making comments, but we are happy to accept comments in the form of a letter or e-mail. Please note that following the close of the consultation and once all of the comments have been processed, all responses will be made publicly available for view.

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

Email: planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk

Telephone: 01255 686177

Yours Sincerely,

Gary Guiver

Planning Policy Manager

Tel: (01255) 686177/ (01255)686188
(01255)686151

Email: planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk

Website: www.tendringdc.gov.uk

14 July 2016

Our Ref: SM/TD Local Plan/2016

Dear Stakeholder

**Tendring District Local Plan-Preferred Options Consultation Document- 2013-2033
and Beyond**

The Council is reviewing its Local Plan. The Local Plan is a statutory document which guides decisions on planning applications across Tendring District.

I am writing to inform you that Tendring District Council is undertaking an eight weeks public consultation of the Local Plan Preferred Options consultation documents. This consultation starts on **Thursday 14 July 2016 and ends on Thursday 8 September 2016 at 5pm.**

This new Local Plan will replace the policies in the adopted Tendring District Local Plan (2007) and the Tendring District Local Plan Proposed Submission Draft (2012/14). Involving the local community is an essential part of the process and will help the Council to decide if there is a reasonable level of agreement on the Preferred Options document or if we need to think again about some of the policy approaches. Various background and technical papers have been prepared to support the Tendring District Local Plan and are available on our website.

The Plan will guide future development in the Tendring area between 2013-2033 and beyond. Having an up-to-date Local Plan is critical for creating new job opportunities, attracting investment in new and improved infrastructure, protecting the environment and ensuring that new homes are built in the right locations and achieve the right standards of quality and design.

The consultation documentations are available to view at the public exhibitions listed below, in libraries throughout the district and during normal opening hours at the Weeley Council Offices and Clacton Town Hall. It is also be available to download from the Council's website **www.tendringdc.gov.uk**.

The following public exhibitions will be held during the consultation period where planning officers from the Council will be on hand to listen to any concerns or suggestions or to answer any questions people might have:

- Monday 18 July 2016 (3pm-7.30pm)-Clacton Essex Hall, Town Hall, Station Road, Clacton
- Wednesday 20 July 2016 (3pm-8pm) - Baker Hall, Crossfield Way, Kirby Cross
- •Wednesday 3 August 2016 (9.30am-1.30pm) - Council Chamber, Weeley
- Saturday 13 August 2016 (10.30am-2.30pm)-Tendring Enterprise School, Jaywick Lane, Clacton-on-Sea, CO16 8BE
- Tuesday 16 August 2016 (3pm-7.30pm)-Dovercourt Central Church, Main Road, Dovercourt
- Friday 19 August 2016 (3pm-7.30pm)- Council Chamber, Council Office, Thorpe Road, Weeley, CO16 9AJ
- Monday 22 August 2016 (1.30pm-6.30pm)-Venture Centre 2000, Bromley Road, Manningtree, CO11 2JE
- Tuesday 30 August 2016 (2.30-6.30pm)-Elmstead Community Centre, School Road, Elmstead Market, CO7 7ET

How to Comment: COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED THROUGH WRITTEN REPRESENTATION AND NOT BY ANY OTHER MEANS INCLUDING PETITIONS AND VOICE MAIL.

Our preferred method of receiving your comments is through the council's online consultation portal: [HTTP://TENDRING-CONSULT.OBJECTIVE.CO.UK](http://TENDRING-CONSULT.OBJECTIVE.CO.UK)

The portal enables you to view the Local Plan and add comments directly on as many or few on the sections as you wish.

Alternatively representations can be emailed to: planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk (Please include Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options consultation document' in the subject line) ideally using our representation form.

If you do not have access to a computer, paper representations can be posted to:

Planning Policy Team, Tendring District Council, Thorpe Road, Weeley, Essex CO16 9 AJ

However please try to use our portal as every letter or email requires considerable administration for us to upload to our portal. We can help you register. Please note that your name, postal town, comments and organisation where applicable will be made publicly available for anyone to view.

Hard copies of the consultation documents are available to view in Tendring District libraries and at council offices during normal opening hours at the Weeley Council Office and Clacton Town Hall.

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

Email: planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk

Telephone: 01255 686177 or 01255686188 or 01255686151

Yours Sincerely,

Simon Meecham

Planning Policy & Regulation Manager

Planning Department
Council Offices
Weeley
Essex CO16 9AJ

Please ask for Mary Foster:

Tel: (01255) 686177

Fax: (01255) 686417

E-mail: planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk

Our Ref: SM/TD Local Plan/2017

16 June 2017

Dear Chairman/ Parish / Town Clerk,

**THE TENDRING DISTRICT DRAFT PUBLICATION LOCAL PLAN
CONSAULTATION (2017)**

On **Friday 16 June 2017 at 9am**, Tendring District Council will publish a new Local Plan for consultation in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

The council is consulting on:

Draft Publication Local Plan consisting of:

- Section One – North Essex Authorities Strategic Plan;
- Section Two – Tendring District Council Policies; and
- their accompanying Sustainability Appraisals

The Local Plan will be the subject of six weeks' public consultation ending at **5.00pm on 28 July 2017**. During that time, any interested party will be welcome to put forward representations expressing their views on the Local Plan. Any representations received after that time will not be taken into account.

The Local Plan and supporting documentation will be available to view on the Council's website www.tendringdc.gov.uk and paper copies will be available to view during normal opening hours at the Weeley Council Offices, Clacton Town Hall and at all the libraries in the district. In addition, to allow local residents the opportunity to view the Local Plan and ask our planning officers any questions, we will be holding the following public drop in sessions:

Tuesday, 27 June 2017	Columbine Centre, Walton - 3-7pm
Thursday, 29 June 2017	Ogilvy Hall, Lawford - 3-7pm
Saturday, 1 July 2017	Baptist Church, Clacton 10-3pm
Tuesday, 4 July 2017	Elmstead Community Centre, Elmstead - 3-7pm
Thursday, 6 July 2017	Council Chamber, Weeley - 3-7pm
Tuesday, 11 July 2017	Methodist Church, Main Road, Dovercourt - 3-7pm

Our preferred method of receiving comments is through the Council's online consultation portal: [HTTP://TENDRING-CONSULT.OBJECTIVE.CO.UK](http://TENDRING-CONSULT.OBJECTIVE.CO.UK) The portal enables everyone to view the documents and add comments directly on as many or few on the sections as they wish.

I would be grateful if your Council can help to promote awareness of this consultation in your local community.

Yours faithfully,

Simon Meecham

Planning Policy and Regulation Manager

The Council is preparing a new Local Plan to guide future development in the Tendring District between now and 2032.

The Council is publishing the 'Tendring District Local Plan: Issues and Options Document' for six weeks consultation starting on Tuesday 1st September and ending on Tuesday 13th October in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) regulations 2012. During that time, interested parties will be welcome to put forward representations expressing their views on the Local Plan.

The new Local Plan will guide future development in the Tendring area between now and 2032. Having an up to date Local Plan is critical for creating new job opportunities, attracting investment in new and improved infrastructure, protecting the environment and ensuring that new homes are built in the right locations and achieve the right standards of quality and design.

The Issues and Options consultation paper and supporting documentation will be available to view:

- at the public exhibitions listed below;
in libraries throughout the district (from the 1st September); and
- during normal opening hours at the Weeley Council Offices and Clacton Town Hall.

The following public exhibitions will be held during the consultation period:

- Saturday 5th September 2015 10:00am to 3:00pm - Pier Avenue Baptist Church, Welcome Hall, Pier Avenue, Clacton;
- Monday 7th September 2015 10am to 9:00pm – Council Offices, Thorpe Road, Weeley;
- Monday 14th September 2015 3pm to 7:30pm – Park Pavilion (Club Room), Barrack Lane, Harwich; and
- Saturday 19th September 2015 12:30pm to 4:30pm – Clacton Coastal Academy, Jaywick Lane, Clacton.

To view an on-line version of the draft Local Plan please [click here](#)

Please make sure that your response clearly sets out which question or subject each of your comments relate to and please also make sure that your name and contact details are included, as anonymous responses will not be accepted. Please also note that following the close of the consultation and once all of the comments have been processed, all responses will be made publicly available.

To download a representation form please [click here](#)

Your representations should be emailed to: planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk

If you do not have access to a computer, paper representations can be posted to:

Planning Policy Team

Tendring District Council

Thorpe Road

Weeley

Essex CO16 9 AJ

If you have any queries or problems in relation to the Local Plan Issues and Options consultation, please do not hesitate to contact the Planning Policy team using the contact details below:

Email: planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk

Telephone: 01255 686177

Dear X

Tendring District Local Plan - Preferred Options 2016 will be available for you to view and comment between the following dates:

Start date: 14/07/16 09:00

End date: 08/09/16 17:00

Please select the following link to view this event:

<http://tendring-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/pp/tdlp/tdlppo>

If the link appears to be broken, please try copying the entire link into the address bar on your web browser.

This e-mail has been automatically generated by the Consultation software.

The information contained in this e-mail or in any attachments is confidential and is intended solely for the named addressee only. Access to this e-mail by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the administrator and do not read, use or disseminate the information. Opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the sender and not necessarily the company. Although an active anti-virus policy is operated, the company accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail, including any attachments.

To unsubscribe please click on the link below or paste it into your browser:

<http://tendring-consult.objective.co.uk/common/unsubscribe.jsp?guid=7235A4F8-1483-32C8-1E80-4E316DBFD FEC>

Dear X

Tendring District Local Plan - Publication Draft - Section 1 will be available for you to view and comment between the following dates:

Start date: 16/06/17 09:00

End date: 28/07/17 17:00

Please select the following link to view this event:

<http://tendring-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/pp/tdlppd/tdlppd>

If the link appears to be broken, please try copying the entire link into the address bar on your web browser.

This e-mail has been automatically generated by the Consultation software.

The information contained in this e-mail or in any attachments is confidential and is intended solely for the named addressee only. Access to this e-mail by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the administrator and do not read, use or disseminate the information. Opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the sender and not necessarily the company. Although an active anti-virus policy is operated, the company accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail, including any attachments.

To unsubscribe please click on the link below or paste it into your browser:

<http://tendring-consult.objective.co.uk/common/unsubscribe.jsp?guid=7235A4F8-1483-32C8-1E80-4E316DBFD FEC>

Dear X

Tendring District Local Plan - Publication Draft - Section 2 will be available for you to view and comment between the following dates:

Start date: 16/06/17 09:00

End date: 28/07/17 17:00

Please select the following link to view this event:

http://tendring.objective.co.uk/portal/pp/tdlppd/tdlp_s2

If the link appears to be broken, please try copying the entire link into the address bar on your web browser.

This e-mail has been automatically generated by the Consultation software.

The information contained in this e-mail or in any attachments is confidential and is intended solely for the named addressee only. Access to this e-mail by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the administrator and do not read, use or disseminate the information. Opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the sender and not necessarily the company. Although an active anti-virus policy is operated, the company accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail, including any attachments.

To unsubscribe please click on the link below or paste it into your browser:

<http://tendring-consult.objective.co.uk/common/unsubscribe.jsp?guid=7235A4F8-1483-32C8-1E80-4E316DBFDFEC>



A PLAN FOR NEW HOMES IN TENDRING

The Council is preparing a new Local Plan to guide future development in the Tendring District between now and 2032.

Having an up to date Local Plan is critical for creating new job opportunities, attracting investment in new and improved infrastructure, protecting the environment and ensuring that any new homes required to meet the needs of a growing population are built in the right locations and achieve the right standards of quality and design.

In the last few months, the Council has received an unprecedented number of unplanned planning applications for housing. The lack of an up to date Local Plan for Tendring makes it harder for the Council to secure the investment we need in our district and also makes our area vulnerable to these speculative development proposals.

We will be seeking the views of local people and other interested parties' views on the big issues facing our district and the difficult decisions that the Council will need to make about future housing development in Tendring. This includes the big decisions about housing development and where in our district the majority of new homes should be built.

Take this opportunity to contribute your ideas and views.

The Tendring District Local Plan: Issues and Options Document contains 29 questions relating to different themes and subjects for consideration.

Between 1st September 2015 and 13th October 2015 we will be inviting your comments and suggestions – please see details overleaf.

Come along and have your say!

Consultation dates and venues:-

- Pier Avenue Baptist Church, Welcome Hall, Pier Avenue, Clacton
10:00am – 3:00pm Saturday 5th September 2015
- Council Offices, Thorpe Road, Weeley
10:00am - 9:00pm Monday 7th September 2015
- Clacton Coastal Academy, Jaywick Lane, Clacton
12:30am - 4:30pm Saturday 19th September 2015

The Local Plan Issues and Options Document can be found at:-

- The Councils website: www.tendringdc.gov.uk
- All libraries throughout the District
- All Council Offices
- Copies of the document have also been sent to your local Town and Parish Councils.



Come along and have your say at one of the exhibitions venues shown below:-

- ◀ **Town Hall, Clacton - Monday 18th July 3pm-7.30pm**
- ◀ **Baker Hall, Kirby Cross – Wednesday 20th July 3pm- 8pm**
- ◀ **Council Chamber, Weeley – Wednesday 3rd August 9.30am – 1.30pm**
- ◀ **Tendring Enterprise School, Jaywick Lane, Clacton – Saturday 13th August 10.30am - 2.30pm**
- ◀ **Dovercourt Central Church, Main Rd, Dovercourt – Tuesday 16th August 3pm – 8pm**
- ◀ **Council Chamber, Weeley – Friday 19th August 3pm - 7.30pm**
- ◀ **Venture Centre Bromley Rd, Lawford 1.30pm - 6.30pm**
- ◀ **Elmstead Community Centre, School Rd, Elmstead Market Tuesday 30th August 2.30pm -6.30pm**

The Local Plan Preferred Options Document can be found at:-

- The Council's website: www.tendringdc.gov.uk
- All libraries throughout the District
- Council Offices at Weeley and Clacton Town Hall
- Copies of the document have also been sent to Town and Parish Councils.
- Any question please telephone the planning policy team on 01255 686177

A NEW PLAN FOR OUR DISTRICT

NOW IS THE TIME!

This is a very challenging – but also an exciting – time for Planning in Tendring District. The District Council needs to prepare a new Local Plan to guide development – to ensure that proposals are sustainable and that we can get the right buildings and facilities in the right places to meet the needs of our existing and future communities.

Identifying land for new housing and employment is important, to ensure that we can control where new development goes and that the community, travel and utility infrastructure which is needed to support this growth is provided.

And without an up-to-date Local Plan, developers can progress schemes which suit them – but often not the local community. Even if the Council refuses planning permission, a government-appointed Planning Inspector will decide the appeal – and the absence of an up-to-date Local Plan means that a lot of appeals are being allowed.

WE NEED YOUR HELP!

Come and see us at our Local Plan exhibitions – and you can view the Preferred Options document on the Council's website, or at local libraries or main Council Offices.

Please let us know what you think about the Council's Preferred Options document. Tell us if you support or object to any parts of it and tell us anything you would like us to say instead.

Details of our exhibitions and how and when to comment are on the other side of this leaflet.

Please bear in mind that we need to plan for development in a positive way – we can protect our District's most special and sensitive buildings and landscapes and make sure that new development is of a high standard – but only if we have the right Local Plan in place!

APPENDIX 4: Press releases and newspaper ads

Daily Gazette

Gazette Friday August 28, 2015

55

Public Notices



Public Notices

THE TENDRING DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN: ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION 2015

Tendring District Council will be undertaking six weeks public consultation on the 'Tendring District Local Plan: Issues and Options Document' starting on Tuesday 1 September 2015, and ending on Tuesday 13 October 2015. The purpose of this consultation exercise is to invite comments on what the new Local Plan for Tendring should contain (in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012). During that time, any interested party will be welcome to put forward their comments.

The new Local Plan will guide future development in the Tendring area between now and 2032.

The consultation documentation will be available to view at the public exhibitions listed below, in libraries throughout the district from 1 September 2015, and during normal opening hours at the Weeley Council Offices and Clacton Town Hall. It will also be available to download from the Council's website www.tendringdc.gov.uk.

The following public exhibitions will be held during the consultation period:

- Saturday 5 September 2015, 10am to 3pm – Pier Avenue Baptist Church, Welcome Hall, Pier Avenue, Clacton.
- Monday 7 September 2015, 10am to 9pm – Council Offices

Standard Friday August 28, 2015 harwichandmanning

Public Notices



Public Notices

THE TENDRING DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN: ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION 2015

Tendring District Council will be undertaking six weeks public consultation on the 'Tendring District Local Plan: Issues and Options Document' starting on Tuesday 1 September 2015, and ending on Tuesday 13 October 2015. The purpose of this consultation exercise is to invite comments on what the new Local Plan for Tendring should contain (in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012). During that time, any interested party will be welcome to put forward their comments.

The new Local Plan will guide future development in the Tendring area between now and 2032.

The consultation documentation will be available to view at the public exhibitions listed below, in libraries throughout the district from 1 September 2015, and during normal opening hours at the Weeley Council Offices and Clacton Town Hall. It will also be available to download from the Council's website www.tendringdc.gov.uk.

The following public exhibitions will be held during the consultation period:

- Saturday 5 September 2015, 10am to 3pm – Pier Avenue Baptist Church, Welcome Hall, Pier Avenue, Clacton.
- Monday 7 September 2015, 10am to 9pm – Council Offices, Thorpe Road, Weeley.
- Monday 14 September 2015, 3pm to 7.30pm – Park Pavilion, Barrack Lane, Harwich.
- Saturday 19 September 2015, 12.30pm to 4.30pm – Clacton Coastal Academy, Jaywick Lane, Clacton.

Press Release

Have your say on Tendring District's New Local Plan

Tendring District's Full Council has today given the go-ahead for an eight-week public consultation to take place on Tendring District's Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation Document. This consultation starts on **Thursday 14th July 2016 and ends on Thursday 8th September 2016 at 5pm.**

Once implemented the New Local Plan will set out how planning applications should be determined, allocate land for housing, employment, retail, hotel and tourism development, open space and green infrastructure and provide policies to protect our heritage assets until 2033 and beyond.

Tendring District Council wants to engage with residents, local groups, businesses and statutory bodies during the production of the plan to ensure that it meets the changing needs and aspirations of the town.

Councillor Neil Stock, Chairman of the Local Plan Committee and the Leader of Tendring District Council, said:

"Whether it is homes, open space for recreation or premises for business to thrive and prosper, we need to ensure that we have the right development coming forward in the right place. The New Local Plan has to balance the need for land for development coming forward with the continued protection of the high quality environment that makes Tendring District an attractive place to live and work and visit". Without an up-to-date Local Plan there is a greater risk of uncontrolled development and lack of new supporting infrastructure".

The Local Plan will be finalised early next year and submitted to the Government Inspector for it to be publicly examined before the Council can adopt it.

As part of the consultation, the following public exhibitions will be held during the consultation period and planning officers from the Council will be on hand to listen to any concerns or suggestions or to answer any questions people might have:

- Monday 18 July 2016-Clacton Essex Hall, Town Hall, Station Road, Clacton, CO15 1SE
- Wednesday 20 July 2016- Baker Hall, Crossfield Way, Kirby Cross, Essex CO13 0LL
- Wednesday 3 August 2016-Weeley Council Chamber, Council Offices, Weeley, CO169AJ
- Saturday 13 August 2016-Tendring Enterprise Studio School, Jaywick Lane, Clacton-on-Sea, CO16 8BE
- Tuesday 16 August 2016- Dovercourt Central Church, Main Road, Dovercourt

- Friday 19 August 2016- Weeley Council Chamber, Council Office, Thorpe Road, Weeley, CO16 9AJ
- Monday 22 August 2016-Venture Centre 2000, Bromley Road, Manningtree, CO11 2JE
- Tuesday 30 August 2016-Elmstead Community Centre, School Road, Elmstead Market, CO7 7ET

Consultation materials and representation form can be downloaded from the Council's website and also available for viewing at:

- Local libraries and
- Council offices during normal opening hours at the Weeley Council Office and Clacton Town Hall.

Comments must be received through written representation and not by any other means including petitions and voice mail.

APPENDIX 5: Report to Local Plan Committee 12 November 2015

LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE

12 NOVEMBER 2015

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING

A.2 RESULTS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE TENDRING DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

(Report prepared by Simon Meecham, Derek Walker and William Fuller)

PART 1 – KEY INFORMATION

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

To provide an initial review of the issues raised through the representations received on the Local Plan 'Issues and Options' consultation. The Issues and Options consultation took place between 1st September 2015 and 13th October 2015.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On 1st September 2015, the Council published an 'Issues and Options' consultation document for its emerging Local Plan. The consultation ended on 13th October 2015 and over 600 submissions, many with multiple representations have been received; four of which submissions include petitions.

The consultation document invited local people, technical stakeholders and other interested parties to consider and put forward their views on the issues facing the district including the location of future development.

This report outlines the responses received to the 7 main issues set out in the public consultation exercise:

Issue 1: Jobs

Issue 2: Homes

Issue 3: Infrastructure

Issue 4: The Environment

Issue 5: Setting out a vision for the future

Issue 6: Options for growth – Four options were presented:

Option 1: Hartley Gardens Suburb

Option 2: Weeley Garden Village

Option 3: Tendring Central Garden Village

Option 4: Higher Urban Densities

Issue 7: Planning Policies

Key findings:

- Technical Stakeholders A number of stakeholders have suggested that a Sustainability Appraisal will be required for the consultation options and the 'Call for Sites' submissions. This will be carried out to aid the next stage of plan production, the 'preferred options'.

The most significant concern expressed by other Councils was to ensure that Tendring adopts the recommended annualised housing target of at least 597 new dwellings each year. Essex County Council (ECC) suggests that Tendring should plan for the higher economic growth scenario which has an annualised housing target of 705 new dwellings each year.

Environmental submissions include the need to protect and enhance the most sensitive habitats and to ensure the provision of appropriately networked Green Infrastructure.

Few technical stakeholders commented specifically in regard to locations for growth although ECC suggests that the potential allocation of East Colchester/West Tendring needs further housing trajectory work to see if more homes could be delivered in the plan period. It suggests that Option 1: Hartley Gardens Suburb and Option 4: Higher Urban Densities are the most sustainable, Option 2: Weeley Garden Village is only sustainable if secondary school travel is by train and Option 3: Tendring Central Garden Village is not sustainable.

- Landowners and Developers The majority of representations proposed sites which could accommodate between 40 – 250 dwellings. Other representations suggested revisions to settlement development boundaries to enable smaller residential developments to take place. There were also two representations from developers and landowners promoting large, mixed use development in support of Option 2: Weeley Garden Village.
- Community Representatives including Town and Parish Councils, residents associations and community groups as well as individual District, Town or Parish Councillors and MPs. The comments received from community representatives were wide-ranging and generally dealt with issues specific to the area being represented. Options 1: Hartley Gardens Suburb and 2: Weeley Garden Village were generally preferred with Option 3: Tendring Central Garden Village being least preferred. The lack of healthcare, transport, education and employment were common concerns. Traffic and congestion issues were also often raised as an area of concern. A number of representatives raised the need for a new town within the District and a number of representatives questioned the need for new housing growth in their particular areas.
- Members of the public The responses from residents were numerous and wide-ranging. Broadly, the benefits of Option 1: Hartley Gardens Suburb, were noted in terms of infrastructure and access to employment although concerns were also raised over the scale and impact of development. The general consensus was that the only advantage for Option 2: Weeley Garden Village was in respect of transport infrastructure, including the railway. The main advantages of Option 3: Tendring Central Garden Village were perceived to be in its proximity to Colchester. Disadvantages included the lack of supporting infrastructure of all types. The main advantages of Option 4: Higher Urban Densities were perceived to be in relation to the reduced need for greenfield land and better job opportunities although disadvantages were also perceived in that respect and in terms of traffic and medical facilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Local Plan Committee:

- notes the main issues raised by the Local Plan ‘Issue and Options’ consultation;**
- make any initial observations for Officers to investigate or consider in preparing the next stage of the Local Plan; and**
- authorises Officers to clarify any representation as necessary.**

PART 2 – IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

DELIVERING PRIORITIES

Achieving affordable excellence: The most fundamental concern raised during the public consultation related to the need to identify sufficient land to meet objectively-assessed need for housing, in full, to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). When considering this issue, the Committee should bear in mind that the way that local authorities are funded through central government has changed significantly in recent years and Councils that support growth in housing are now rewarded through the grant of 'New Homes Bonus'. Also increasing housing development will increase the authority's Council Tax base, its ability to secure for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and, based on the advice of the Economic Development Strategy, new housing development in the right locations will support growth in the economy and the creation of new jobs, helping to address deprivation and further increase revenue to the Council.

Improving public perception and reputation: Whilst the need to substantially increase the level of housing development proposed in the Local Plan will lead to some criticism and objections from residents, particularly in the areas of the district that will be affected most, producing a Local Plan that positively embraces the government's growth agenda, helps deliver the objectives of the Economic Development Strategy and demonstrates cooperation with adjoining authorities and other bodies will raise the Council's standing amongst Essex authorities and place it in a better position to attract external funding toward investment in new infrastructure, including from the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). With a significantly higher level of growth proposed during the plan period as compared to that identified within the 2012/14 draft Local Plans, Officers consider it right that the public and others were consulted again in order to fully engage with the plan-making process.

Helping children and young people to achieve their full potential: Some of the concerns raised during the public consultation, especially by Essex County Council, related to the provision of school places in some of the district's towns and villages and the ability of the Local Plan to fully embrace the recommendations of the Economic Development Strategy to maximise the opportunities for new jobs and better training opportunities for future generations. The need to review the Local Plan provides an opportunity to address these issues.

Addressing deprivation: The Council's Economic Development Strategy advises the Council to facilitate population growth in the right locations to help generate growth in the economy. The need to review the Local Plan to increase levels of housing development in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides an opportunity to fully embrace this objective, and other objectives in the Economic Development Strategy, to bring positive economic growth to the district.

Local housing for local people: The need to review the Local Plan to substantially increase the amount of land identified for housing development in line with national policy provides the opportunity to better address the district's future housing needs amongst all sectors of the community, taking into account the district's popularity for retirement, the demands for housing arising from economic growth and job creation in the district and the needs of local working people with low incomes that cannot afford to buy or rent property on the open market.

Coastal opportunities and protection: The new version of the Local Plan will continue to recognise both the importance of our coastline for the local economy and the quality of life for our residents, but also the threats of flooding and coastal erosion that affect local residents and businesses. The need to review the

Local Plan also provides the opportunity to maximise potential economic benefits arising from the proposed coastal defences in Clacton, including the potential for new tourist attractions and facilities for residents and visitors.

RESOURCES AND RISK

Resources: The new version of the Local Plan will be prepared by the Council's Planning Policy Team under the leadership of the Planning Policy Manager with input, scrutiny and endorsement from the Local Plan Committee. The costs involved in preparing updated evidence, printing documents, publicity and examination will be met through the agreed 'LDF Budget'. Where it is possible to address objections raised by residents and other stakeholders without undermining the overall soundness of the Local Plan, including its conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), it should help to reduce the length and cost of the plan making process, particularly the examination stages.

Risks: In considering comments and objections submitted by residents and other interested parties, the Council needs to accept that it will not be possible to please everyone. Whatever course of action the Council decides to take, there will continue to be objections, such is the nature of the planning process. The greatest risks to the progress of the Local Plan through the process of examination and adoption relate to compliance, or failure to comply, with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other requirements planning legislation. It is therefore essential that these issues, relating in particular to housing supply and the legal duty to cooperate, are addressed as a matter of priority.

LEGAL

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 state that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the 'development plan' unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The statutory 'development plan' for Tendring, as it stands is the 2007 Adopted Local Plan however, in accordance with the government's National Planning Policy Framework, the policies and proposals in the Adopted Local Plan are increasingly out of date and cannot be afforded full weight. It is therefore essential to progress the emerging Local Plan through the remaining stages of the plan making process and ensure it meets the requirements of national planning policy so it can become the new statutory development plan. Section 15 of the 2004 Act provides the local planning authority will approve 'Development Plan Documents' including the Local Plan.

Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), as amended by Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 places a duty upon local authorities and other public bodies to cooperate on strategic matters of cross-boundary significance, which includes housing supply. Before a Planning Inspector can begin the process of examining a Local Plan, he or she needs to be satisfied, with evidence, that the local authority has done everything it can to ensure effective cooperation with neighbouring authorities and other partner organisations and has sought to resolve, as far as is possible, any cross-boundary planning issues. With this in mind, Members should note that both Essex County Council and Colchester Borough Council have raised fundamental objections to the current version of the Draft Local Plan relating to housing numbers and therefore, as things stand, it will not be possible to demonstrate to and Inspector that cooperation has been effective.

The Local Plan must be prepared, consulted upon and examined in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. At the examination, the Planning Inspector will need to be content that these regulations have been followed and that the scope for any legal challenges have

been minimised.

Alongside the legal and regulatory requirements, the Local Plan, as amended, will eventually be judged through an examination, by a Planning Inspector, against the following policy tests, as set out by the government in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Local Plan must be shown to be:

- “Positively Prepared” – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- “Justified” – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- “Effective” – the plan should be deliverable over its plan period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- “Consistent with national policy” – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.

When considering the issues raised in this report, the Committee should bear these tests in mind and should also consider whether any of the areas of objection genuinely bring the Local Plan’s soundness into question.

OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Consideration has been given to the implications of the proposed decision in respect of the following and any significant issues are set out below.

Crime and Disorder / Equality and Diversity / Health Inequalities /Area or Ward affected / Consultation/Public Engagement.

Area or Ward affected: All wards.

PART 3 – SUPPORTING INFORMATION

COMMENTS FROM TECHNICAL STAKEHOLDERS

In summary the technical stakeholders below have provided links and best practice advice for producing a robust Local Plan. A number of stakeholders also point to the need to carry out a Sustainability Appraisal of the options and submitted Call for Sites proposals. The most significant concern expressed by other Councils is to ensure that Tendring adopts the recommended annualised housing target of at least 597 dwellings each year. Essex County Council suggests Tendring should plan for the higher economic growth scenario which requires an annualised target 705 homes per year.

The organisations with natural environment interests are keen to ensure that Tendring fully maps sensitive habitats and creates effective policy for green infrastructure. Other stakeholders point to potential deficiencies in infrastructure (such as water recycling capacity) and the need for collaborative work to overcome such deficiencies. The Theatres Trust seeks that the Local Plan will protect and enhance existing

community infrastructure.

In terms of locations for growth few technical stakeholders have specifically commented. Babergh in Suffolk have objected to growth in Manningtree, Lawford or Mistley being considered as part the 15 year land supply for the Local Plan on the basis that such allocations could prejudice the viability and infrastructure requirements of their allocated site in Brantham. Essex County Council suggests the potential of East Colchester / West Tendring allocation needs further housing trajectory work as it may deliver more housing in the plan period. Essex County Council suggests that Hartley Meadows (option 1) and urban density option (option 4) are most sustainable, Weeley (option 2) only sustainable if secondary school travel is by train and that Tendring Central (option 3) is not sustainable.

Chelmsford City Council

Concern that Tendring members are showing less confidence in the PBA OAHN report when Chelmsford, Colchester and Braintree have accepted the report. Moreover concern that members are seen as going for the lowest figure in the report rather than the evidence based approach of the report. Concern that the consultation has not listed 705 homes per annum required to meet higher economic growth. Confirms 'on-record' willingness for Chelmsford, Braintree and Colchester to accommodate the upward adjustment from 597 to 705 to meet the demand for workers but sees no evidence for the lower figure of 479 (written as 497 in CCC's submission).

Concern that a Sustainability Appraisal did not accompany the Issues and Options consultation.

Braintree District Council

Braintree's submission mirrors the concern of Chelmsford in terms of an annualised housing figure of less than 597 dwellings per year and the 'on-record' willingness to cooperate above 597 if employment growth is higher.

In addition the Council suggest the benefits of potential improvements to the A120, as jointly supported through the Haven Gateway Partnership, for existing communities and new economic growth should feature more prominently in Tendring's plan going forward.

Colchester Borough Council

Colchester Borough Council considers that this Council should attach more weight to the co-operation work between the Councils rather than simply referring to the Tendring / East Colchester option. It shares a similar concern to Chelmsford in relation to Tendring's approach to the housing evidence. It does however go further in its formal consultation submission by adding the following: 'Colchester Borough Council takes housing delivery seriously but will not be able to make up any shortfall in housing delivery in Tendring because of the high targets already being accommodated within the borough.' Clarification is being sought on whether this applies to the 479 or 597 potential housing target.

Essex County Council

Essex County Council has provided a comprehensive response to the consultation and has also provided some model policies for Tendring to consider on transport, biodiversity, the natural and built environment, landscape, countryside and green infrastructure. Some key points made on the consultation include:

- TDC to constructively provide for the higher housing target as indicated the OAN study 2015
- A Sustainability Appraisal of the reasonable alternatives needs to be carried out now and before preferred options
- The Issues and options consultation does not mention the Duty to co-operate or identify strategic

cross-boundary issues

- The consultation refers to 3-5000 jobs to be created using the 2013 Tendring Economic Strategy but this was based on housing growth of 12,000 dwellings.
- ECC has concerns about year round operation of some holiday parks and considers the accommodation to be unsuitable for children in winter months
- More emphasis should be placed on the importance of telecommunications
- ECC recognises the district has highway constraints and is undertaking assessments for mitigating potential impacts of growth options
- TDC should focus growth where infrastructure is available or can viably be provided
- TDC should ensure provision is made for extra care housing
- TDC should look to the annual 'Commission school Places in Essex' to identify capacity at schools to inform locations for growth
- TDC should identify the total possible delivery of homes for its 'fixed option' of West Tendring and what can be delivered in the emerging plan periods
- Option 1 (Hartley Gardens Suburb) is sustainable in school placement terms
- Option 2 (Weeley Garden Village) is sustainable from primary school but would only be from a secondary school perspective if the railway was used to transport pupils to and from the Frinton campus of the Tendring Technology College
- Option 3 (Tendring Central Garden Village) least sustainable in terms of public transport, road infrastructure requirements and viability
- Option 4 (Higher Urban Densities) Benefits of this option include maximising capacity of primary and secondary school, promotion of sustainable travel and supporting the viability of town centres,

Suffolk County Council

Suffolk County Council asks that consideration is given to the adopted Babergh District Core Strategy allocation at Brantham and any potential impact of growth in Manningtree in relation to transport and cross county school places. It will be clarified if 'Manningtree' is also meant to encompass Lawford and Mistley in Tendring's considerations.

Babergh District Council

Babergh District Council objects the level of growth proposed for Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley due to potential impact on an established unimplemented allocation, which is subject to a planning application in Babergh at Brantham. This impact is considered in relation to cumulative highway matters and material prejudice to delivering the strategic allocation. Babergh also objects to "unallocated application" sites at Lawford.

Furthermore, Babergh considers Tendring has had limited discussions with it under the Duty to Cooperate and 'therefore expects to see more joint working'.

RSPB

Supports the Council's intention to protect the environment but should seek to 'enhance' it. Suggests the Council should carry out a Green Infrastructure study and ensure that it strives for a net gain for nature – ensuring sites are mapped as per the NPPF. Reminds the Council of the requirement for a Habitat's Regulation Assessment. Suggests the Council creates a SUDS SPD. The RSBP suggests changes to the vision (under question 18) incorporate integrated networks of protected wildlife rich areas.

Essex Wildlife Trust

The EWT's comments to some extent mirror the RSPB's but details that the Council should have a baseline assessment for biodiversity, protection of species through human disturbance zones and safe areas for human and domestic animal recreation (reference is made to SANGS – suitable accessible natural green space). The Trust also recommends an SLA with the EWT Biological Records Centre to ensure monitoring and compliance with the Natural environmental and natural Communities Act (2006). The EWT supports the vision change proposed by the RSPB.

The Trust 'strongly objects' to the Colchester / Tendring development siting potential damage to the Salary Brook valley and nature reserve. It does however refer to opportunities to promote the preservation, restoration and recovery of priority habitats in para. 117 of the NPPF. The Trust points to the first principles of 'Living Landscapes' to ensure new development fulfils all criteria for sustainability.

Hamford Water Management Committee

The Committee has written to the Council through this Local Plan consultation to advise of erosion at the Naze to Stone Point and is seeking remedy to the issue. This letter has been passed to the relevant Director at Tendring District Council.

The Theatres Trust

The Trust points out the emphasis in the consultation is on new infrastructure when protecting and enhancing existing infrastructure is of importance to communities and their health and well-being. The Trust provides a model policy for the Council's consideration.

To reflect item 70 of the NPPF, we recommend a policy along the lines of:

Community and Cultural Facilities

The council will resist the loss or change of use of existing community and cultural facilities unless replacement facilities are provided on site or within the vicinity which meet the need of the local population, or necessary services can be delivered from other facilities without leading to, or increasing, any shortfall in provision, and it has been demonstrated that there is no community need for the facility or demand for another community use on site.

Anglian Water

Anglian Water asks if connection to the foul water systems would be a requirement of developing 'holiday lodge parks in the district'. They also state that Clacton and Jaywick Water Recycling Centres (Sewage Treatment Works) are at capacity and would require upgrades to accommodate growth.

Environment Agency

Reminds the Council of the SFRA, SMP, Catchment Flood Management and the sequential and exception tests to guide options. Suggests CIL could be used to protect existing areas of risk and that a high quality water environment is good for health.

Suggest SUDS and wider green infrastructure are key to surface water disposal and refers the Council to the Biodiversity Planning Toolkit. Suggests CIL should particularly focus on flood risk at Harwich, Parkeston, Dovercourt, Manningtree, Jaywick, Point Clear and Brightlingsea. For new development the agency urges the Council to ensure that they are resilient over their lifetime and help improve the sustainability of existing communities. The agency also suggests the Council uses in its policy development and evidence base various existing and soon to be published reports.

The agency also suggests minimisation of internal water through policy, subject to the national Housing Standards review.

Suggests some commentary on waste water will be helpful in the local plan both in terms of its economic benefit and locational issues away from communities.

Historic England

The response from Historic England helpfully sets out an approach to support the development of Local Plans. It refers to site selection methodology and provides a good practice guide. Historic England have made no comments in relation to the issues and options presented in the consultation.

Natural England

Welcomes the environmental impact caveat of extending occupancy seasons in holiday accommodation. Also makes clear that any site development within 2km of recognised protected sites needs to be consulted upon with Natural England (NE). NE suggests a district wide approach to the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and considers the district wide approach to establishing sites for homes will aid this assessment.

Expresses that some sewage capacities have been reached and such capacity should be considered in the HRA. Reference is also made regarding the implementation of Green Infrastructure and the further work needed on the in the Council's overall infrastructure delivery plan.

NE welcomes the support for the extension of the Suffolk and Coasts and Heaths AONB and asks the Council to be mindful of any development proposals within or within the setting of the proposed extension. It also references further areas the Council can obtain more detailed information on protected sites including the 'Site Improvement Plans' of Natura 2000 sites.

NE would welcome both HRA information and council collaboration in known areas of risk including; Middle Beach, Irlham's Beach and Stone Point at the Naze. Other points NE makes is for the Council to work collaboratively on visitor surveys, the England Coastal Path and that the four growth options do avoid the most sensitive areas of the district and therefore have no strong views; however NE highlights option 4 (density) may require further land consideration e.g. country parks to offset the increased densities. In terms of transport sustainability, options 1 (Clacton / Hartley) and 2 (Weeley) are considered to offer the lowest carbon options.

NE also lists a number of key areas that it considers that a Local Plan should include.

Transport England

Transport England (TE) notes the rural nature of the district making sustainable transport difficult and expensive. It also recognises the demographic pressure on public services and the viability challenges for any mitigation measures for growth.

TE supports 'in principle' Essex County Council traffic modelling to confirm pressure points and identify appropriate mitigation. For West Tendring / East Colchester modelling and funding work would be required for the junction and link road. Weeley and Frating would need similar mitigation investigation.

TE expresses concern that public transport appears to have been overlooked as part of the strategy and reminds the Council regarding the pressure for improvements to the A120.

Police and Crime Commissioners for Essex (PCC)

The PCC have written in relation to the Community Infrastructure Levy. Essentially this a call for consideration of police staffing and resources contributions from CIL Regulation 122. CIL consultation is undertaken through a separate though linked process to the Local Plan. The PCC's response to this consultation will inform consideration of the matters to be raised in Tendring's CIL evidence base for consulting on a charging schedule for Tendring.

Marine Management Organisation (MMO)

The MMO welcomes potential support for offshore renewable energy, open space and views of the coast and that the environment can help with flood mitigation in the coast and estuaries. It suggests these could be themes for the South East (inshore & offshore) Plan when commenced. The MMO also provides links to guidance, the Marine Policy Statements and the Marine Information System.

COMMENTS FROM BUSINESSES, LANDOWNERS AND DEVELOPERS

67 representations received.

50 of the representations received were from businesses, landowners and developers generally seeking to promote either the inclusion of land in the Local Plan for development or to support sites that had already been included.

The majority of these representations were from landowners and developers proposing sites which they consider could accommodate between 40 – 250 dwellings. A smaller number suggested revisions to settlement development boundaries, particularly in rural areas, to enable smaller residential developments to take place. There were two representations from developers and landowners promoting much larger, mixed use, development proposals for Weeley.

Some of the representations include challenges to the housing figures in the revised Local Plan, in particular the lack of sufficient land to address the objectively-assessed need for housing, in full, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). There were also a number of objections to some of the Council's policies aimed at controlling the size, type, density and quality of residential development arguing that some of the policies were too prescriptive and could make development unviable in some areas.

The most notable representations from businesses, landowners and developers promoting the larger sites for development are summarised below:

Hawkstone Vale

Hawkstone Vale is promoting the 'Old Gas Works Site', Old Road, Clacton for retail use.

The site is allocated and identified (respectively) for retail use in the both the current Adopted and proposed Draft Local Plan and the promoter wishes to ensure that it remains designated for retail use.

Lanswood

Lanswood is promoting land for commercial use south west of Lanswood Park, Clacton Road, Elmstead for business units, in addition to the 4.17 ha of land to the north subject of an implemented planning permission.

The permitted site is shown as a safeguarded Employment Site on the Draft Proposals Map. The business states that its ownership extends to the area of land identified in the submission, which would roughly double the size of the permitted site.

Haltermann Carless

Haltermann Carless (Harwich Refinery) is promoting a total of 3.6 ha of employment land for future expansion to the west of the existing petrochemical site.

This land was previously considered for inclusion in the 2007 Local Plan. The proposer had understood that the land was to be allocated on the Adopted Plan 2007 Proposals Map and that a policy reference would be included within a revised Policy HAR3(b). Although the proposal was put forward at Examination, the Local Plan Inspector did not accept it, stating "Any fully-justified further extensions of the Carless refinery after 2011 - including what I have called the western extension - should be the subject of the Council's first LDF." The business was subsequently sold and the new owner states that there is potential for significant investment and expansion of the Harwich Refinery with an increase in employment.

Silverbrook Estates

Silverbrook Estates is promoting Walton Mere Waterfront (Walton-on-the-Naze) as a mixed/residential/commercial development to include at least 200 homes along with commercial units (e.g. cafes, shops, small offices and workshops).

The land identified by the developer is part of that proposed to be allocated in the Draft Local Plan primarily for leisure, recreation and tourism uses.

Mistley Place Limited

Mistley Place Limited is promoting part of Mistley Place Park (Mistley) for 75 dwellings as 'enabling' development to support park-related environmental management and community benefits.

The land identified by the developer is proposed as protected Recreational Open Space in the Adopted Local Plan and Safeguarded Local Green Space in the Draft Local Plan, in addition to being within a Strategic Green Gap.

EMP Kirby Limited

EMP Kirby Limited is promoting about 5.0 ha of land south of Thorpe Road, Kirby Cross for up to 110 dwellings.

It is the promoter's stated intention to submit a planning application imminently. The main part of the site lies adjacent to the existing and proposed settlement boundaries and borders onto the railway line to the south. The existing Green Gap notation is not proposed to be included on the Draft Proposals Map.

The Land and Planning Company

The Land and Planning Company is promoting land south of Thorpe Road, Kirby Cross for up to 50 dwellings.

The main part of the site lies adjacent to the existing and proposed settlement boundaries and extends towards the railway line to the south. The existing Green Gap notation is not proposed to be included on the Draft Proposals Map.

Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP and Elizabeth Clarke

Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP and Elizabeth Clarke are promoting land east of Halstead Road, Kirby Cross for up to 240 dwellings and greenspace.

The proposal site is subject of a current planning application ref: 15/01234/OUT.

Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP and Mrs K Rose, Mr P Rose and Mrs J Dorrington Ward

Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP and Mrs K Rose, Mr P Rose and Mrs J Dorrington Ward are promoting land south of Harwich Road, Mistley for up to 135 dwellings and greenspace.

The proposal site is subject of a current planning application ref: 15/01520/OUT.

Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP and Marny MacDonald, Robert MacDonald and Robert Logan MacDonald

Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP and Mary MacDonald, Robert MacDonald and Robert Logan MacDonald are promoting land off Heckfords Road, Great Bentley for up to 50 dwellings.

The land is sited partly adjacent to the existing defined settlement boundary and land at Sturicks Farm which was granted planning permission at appeal for 32 dwellings (planning application ref: 14/00431/FUL).

Scott Properties

Scott Properties is promoting 'Oakwood Park Garden Suburb' at land east of Thorpe Road, south of Holland Road, Clacton. This area of land would include mixed uses comprising: residential (33.6 ha), education (2.1 ha), health (1.0 ha), employment (0.94 ha), open space (4.5 ha), care (1.88 ha) and a local centre (1.93 ha). An area of land further to the east, adjoining that land is also identified by the promoter as "Potential area for future expansion", extending up to the railway line.

The Issues and Options Consultation Document considers the area as an option for growth under all 4 alternative approaches. It is estimated that up to 1,600 dwellings could be accommodated. Planning permission exists for residential and business development on land east of Thorpe Road

M Scott Properties Limited

M Scott Properties Limited is promoting land east of Landermere Road, Thorpe-le-Soken for up to 120 dwellings.

The south-western part of the proposal site lies adjacent to the existing and proposed settlement boundaries and borders onto an area of protected open space in the current adopted and proposed draft Local Plans.

M Scott Properties Limited

M Scott Properties Limited is promoting land east of Station Road, Thorington for up to 40 dwellings.

The proposal site lies between two lines of ribbon development fronting onto Station Road and extends to the maximum depth of adjacent rear gardens.

M Scott Properties Limited

M Scott Properties Limited is promoting land north of Clacton Road, Thorington for up to 100 dwellings.

The proposal site abuts a line of ribbon development fronting onto Station Road and lies partly adjacent to

the existing and proposed settlement boundaries and an area of protected open space in the current Adopted and proposed Draft Local Plan.

Taylor Wimpy UK Limited

Taylor Wimpy UK Limited is promoting land at Hawk Farm, north of Colchester Road/east of Crown Lane, Weeley for a major mixed-use development in the centre of the district, comprising about 450 dwellings and land for a primary school; local centre; medical centre; sports; amenity space and community hall.

The proposal site could form part of a wider strategic development, as outlined in the Weeley Garden Village concept - Option 2. It would deliver about 25% of the homes envisaged for Weeley under that Option, along with education, medical, community and local facilities.

Hawkspur Limited

Hawkspur Limited is promoting land for up to 100 dwellings north of Colchester Road/Wick Lane, Ardleigh to include 40 affordable dwellings.

The proposal site abuts a line of ribbon development fronting onto Colchester Road and lies partly adjacent to the existing and proposed settlement boundaries in the current Adopted and proposed Draft Local Plan.

Graham Blandini

Graham Blandini is promoting land to the north of St John's Road, Clacton for about 43 dwellings.

The area of land described generally in the representation forms part of an allocation in the Adopted Local Plan but is not shown as such in the Draft Local Plan. However, it does lie within the defined settlement boundary in both local plans. The bulk of the allocated land has now been built-out by Bloor Homes. The site is too small to form part of a strategic allocation but lies within part of the general area outlined in the Hartley Gardens Suburb – Option 1.

Miss A Burgess

Miss A Burgess is promoting two sites at land at Turpins Farm, Walton Road, Kirby-le-Soken.

All of this land is currently within a Green Gap in the Adopted Local Plan. The Draft Local Plan proposes that an area of land (reflected in Site 1 of the proposer's submission) west of Elm Tree Avenue is allocated for housing and public open space. The proposer anticipates submitting a planning application for at least 250 houses in the near future. The proposer suggests that the proposal Site 2 could deliver about 250 dwellings.

Summary of responses to Call for Sites

The submissions for the 'Call for Sites', to a large extent have identified the actual land being promoted; along with details of site areas and the scale of development sought. In total, businesses, landowners and developers have promoted 50 sites which they consider suitable for a range of development - principally housing. Some mixed-use schemes have been submitted on larger sites along with a smaller number of employment-only and retail-only proposals which relate to existing employment and retail land. Although some promoters have stated the maximum number of dwellings which they consider suitable for their sites, not all have followed suite. Land for approximately 3,941 new dwellings has been indicated in the specific submissions received. In order to explore more fully the possibility of allocating suggested sites, it is therefore proposed to invite those promoters (who have not already done so) to state the area/s of the site/s they wish to promote and indicate the scale of development they consider suitable for their site/s.

List of locations of responses to Call for Sites, including main type of development being promoted

1. Heath Road, Tendring – R + E
2. Frating Road, Great Bromley - R
3. Carless Refinery, Parkeston - E
4. The Street, Kirby-le-Soken - R
5. Broomfield Road, Elmstead Market - E
6. Walton Mere, Walton-on-the-Naze – R + M
7. Mistley Place Park, Mistley - R
8. New Road, Mistley - R
9. Clacton Road/Bentley Road, Weeley Heath - R
10. Thorpe Road, Kirby Cross - R
11. Thorpe Road/Holland Road, Clacton – R + M
12. Tye Road, Elmstead Market - R
13. Former Gasworks, Old Road, Clacton - S
14. Heckfords Road, Great Bentley - R
15. Harwich Road, Mistley - R
16. Halstead Road, Kirby Cross - R
17. Sladbury's Lane, Clacton - R
18. Clacton Road, Thorrington - R
19. Landermere Road, Thorpe-le-Soken - R
20. Crown Lane/Colchester Road, Weeley – R + M
21. Wick Lane, Ardleigh - R
22. Tendring Road, Thorpe-le-Soken – R or E
23. Landermere Road, Thorpe-le-Soken - R
24. Clacton Road, Thorrington - R
25. Station Road, Thorrington - R
26. Thorpe Road, Kirby Cross - R
27. Clacton Road, Weeley Heath - R
28. Cherry Tree Avenue, Clacton - R
29. Church Road/Orchard Close, Elmstead Market - R
30. Sparrows Corner, Great Oakley - R
31. Thorpe Road, Kirby Cross - R
32. Weeley Road, Great Bentley - R
33. Chartfield Drive, Kirby-le-Soken - R
34. Plough Road, Aingers Green, Great Bentley - R
35. Wick Lane/Colchester Road/Dead Lane, Ardleigh - R
36. Colchester Road, Ardleigh - R
37. Aveline Road, Ardleigh - R
38. Harwich Road, Ardleigh - R
39. Halstead Road, Kirby-le-Soken - R
40. Thorpe Road, Kirby Cross - R
41. Clacton Road, Weeley Heath - R
42. The Street, Little Clacton - R
43. Station Road, Wrabness - R
44. Turpins Farm, Kirby-le-Soken - R
45. Walton Road, Kirby-le-Soken - R
46. St John's Road, Clacton – R
47. Colchester Road, Weeley – R
48. Part Mayflower Primary School, Harwich - R
49. Greenacres, Clacton - R
50. Lodge Road, Little Oakley - R

Key

R = Residential

E = Employment
S = Retail
M = Mixed (combined uses)

COMMENTS FROM COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

Many of the representations were from community representatives including Town and Parish Councils, residents associations and community groups as well as individual District, Town or Parish Councillors and MPs. The most notable representations are summarised below.

The comments received from community representatives were wide-ranging and generally dealt with issues specific to the area being represented. In general some patterns of responses can be highlighted to Members. Options 1 and 2 were generally preferred with Option 3 being least preferred. The lack of healthcare, transport, education and employment were common themes which appear regularly. Traffic and congestion issues were also often raised as an area of concern. A number of representatives raised the need for a new town within the District and a number of representatives questioned the need for new housing growth in their particular areas.

Ward Councillors

Ward councillors offered a variety of views which include:

- Opposed to large scale developments in the open countryside, considered all large scale developments should be close to existing towns, school, GP's, reasonable bus route and preferably a railway station. That Tendring Central Garden Village is in a non-sustainable location for a variety of reasons. He also considered the Council needs to manage growth and protect the open countryside and Local Green Gaps.
- Considered building homes in one area is preferable as it would include the supporting infrastructure - where roads can support an increase in traffic is preferable. Support for "new towns" settlements, especially if a rail link can be established to encourage commuting and discourage road use
- Object to Option 3 – destruction of a green lane with a wide diversity of Flora and Fauna, concerns of ecological impact – does not deliver Sustainable development
- Did not support an economic strategy which prioritises the care industry and offshore renewable energy; should focus greater resources on maximising economic growth in water sports, marine industries, commercial and leisure. Vital that TDC retains green gap policies. Option 1 – prefer – Clacton is a main/biggest Tendring town – lead to bigger and better retail offer in a town, infrastructure will be cheaper and more deliverable, lower grade agricultural land would be lost. Option 3 – second preferred – proximity to Colchester for jobs and retail offer will support sustainability. Has advantages in terms of deliverable infrastructure needs – being closer to Colchester. Option 2 and 4 have equal preference – Weeley Garden Village is central to the district and close to A120/A133 artery roads whilst having a school, railway station plus limited retail and service offers. Probably a mix of higher quality larger houses and smaller cottages and bungalows to meet affordable demand and obligation. Only grade 3 agricultural land would be lost, the B1027 through Thorpe is not an advantage.

- 705 dwelling per annum (dpa) is too high – TDC has been building 360 dpa over the last decade; priority for the Jaywick regeneration is absent; lack of support for jobs growth in light industrial sector and the leisure section benefitting from the magnificent new beach. Insufficient priority to A133 Weeley to Frating upgrade; 1000 houses from Colchester/Tendring border is too low; development of land between Thorpe Le Soken village and station should be specifically identified; St Johns road is not adequate to support regeneration in the area of West Clacton; need an adapted version of Hartley Gardens; Clacton reasonable prices for businesses compared to Colchester; New beach in Clacton/Holland opens up the opportunity to develop the leisure industry

Town and Parish Councils

Alresford Parish Council

- Generally positive about the issues and options document. The Parish Council consider that further clarification was required in relation to the lack of healthcare and transport provision. A suggestion was made to create a new town. Concerns rose that the creation of jobs is optimistic. Questions in regard to scale of housing growth around villages. Concerns raised over placing further pressure on infrastructure. Smaller well planned development is welcome. Concerns in regard to speculative planning applications.

Ardleigh Parish Council

- The Parish Council had concerns the document is too vague. Infrastructure in many areas in Tendring is already at breaking point. An investigation should be carried out into the available infrastructure before granting planning permission. Locate businesses close to residential areas. Make the planning process easier for businesses to get change of use for existing but un-used building. Prevent building aspirational housing. Concentrate on the provision of cheaper housing to buy or rent for local people. Ensure that all schemes for residential development have a fair percentage of affordable housing. It is disappointing that the question of an adequate infrastructure being in place has been consistently ignored in the recent past. As the Local Planning Authority TDC has to listen to the views of local residents. Higher urban densities to prevent excessive use of valuable agricultural land

Elmstead Parish Council

- Agricultural land, open countryside and rural life should be maintained. The local plan should be sustainable and development needs to be supported by adequate infrastructure and public services, ranging from roads, public transport, leisure and nature through to education, medical and other community facilities. Development needs to be focussed on more creative use of brownfield sites and the larger conurbations. Concerned with the emphasis on the needs of the housing types. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) should be given to the village to address the infrastructure required within that community. Concerned with capacity of the current local infrastructure. Concern over the impact of unsuitable development on open countryside. Would like to see more creative thought applied to sustain biodiversity and for green infrastructure. Local energy needs through small scale production should be met through local energy generation in new developments. Priority should be given to developments that include sustainable construction. Current public transport does not allow for social activity in the evenings. Options 2 and 4 are best as it will have least impact on traffic and commuting along the A133 to Colchester. There are too many greenfield sites earmarked

for development.

Frating Parish Council

- The Parish Council object to Option 3. Option 3 will urbanise the rural area with the loss of Frating Green, Balls Green, Hare Green and Ravens Green. Loss of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. lack of infrastructure on the A133/A120 – traffic congestion. Upgrade the problem areas – Frating roundabout, Weeley roundabout, duelling the A133/A120 and a new link slip road to Harwich from Clacton. Public transport very limited with the withdrawal of No.77 bus route – makes it difficulties of getting out for shopping, medical facilities and education facilities. People will use cars more. No rail link in the area. Concerns over medical facilities. Concerns over education. There is a Ground Water Protection Zone – the underground water stretches from Great Bentley through Frating and into Great Bromley – protected site as per European Directive – could be contaminated with a development – Option 3 Frating suffers badly from sewer and ground water problems. Not a sustainable development and does not meet TDC's own planning policies. The site has been put forward twice for a similar development and both been rejected by the Planning Inspectorate

Frinton and Walton Town Council

- Issue 1. Jobs – The Town Council agreed that the creation of employment and jobs should be a top priority for the Council. Infrastructure transport links are important in decision-making. The need for industrial sites was noted and a specific example was given. Issue 2. Homes – The Town Council agreed that we need to deliver housing; this should not be at the expense of quality or space standards. Concerns were raised regarding shared surfaces in new development. The suggestion of a housing trust was also submitted to assist in the delivery of affordable housing. Issue 3. Infrastructure – Concerns were raised with regard to Community Infrastructure Levy. Issue 4. The Environment – The Town Council agree that protecting the environment is an important issue. The Town Council highlight the importance of Green Gaps within the emerging Local Plan. Concerns were raised in regard to the Objectively Assessed Housing Needs Study. Issue 5, Vision for the Future – The proposed medical facility referred to in the vision should be a requirement rather than an aspiration. Small businesses should be allowed to expand and there should be greater space within new development. Issue 6, Opportunities for Growth – Support for growth to the east of Colchester. Support for a new town near the A120. Support is given for employment development at Horsley Cross. Concerns in regard to the loss of high grade agricultural land and questions in relation to other planning applications in the area. Issue 7, Planning Policy – Concerns raised over proposed policies. It was considered that policies need to be more area-specific. Note has also been made of national planning guidance.

Great Bentley Parish Council

- The Parish Council agrees that creating the conditions for economic development and creating new jobs should be a top priority. The emphasis must be on quality of build and design. We must not build now the slums of the future. The Parish Council agrees that the local plan is critical for making sure we have the right infrastructure in place. Option 3, The Parish Council agrees with the vision for the future but more thought needs to be given to encouraging affluent people in to the district with their increased spending power. Option 3, this site is not close enough to Colchester. It's in the wrong location for business, surely Horsley Cross has taught us a lesson that you can't create demand. All transport derived transport make this the most unsustainable location of all the proposals. A suggestion was made to build housing in the Elmstead Market Area. Option 3 is completely unsustainable. Concerns that the 800 homes will not be enough to pay for the affordable

housing and infrastructure. The Parish Council have suggested that it would be better to concentrate housing around the Colchester fringe. Development should be based around where infrastructure can be reinforced and where people want to live. The Council needs to hurry up and get the plan in place so everyone knows what is going on. The Council needs to reconsider the Aspirational Housing Policy in order to encourage more affluent people in to the area

Gt. Bromley Parish Council

- Economic growth should be priority. TDC should be utilising brownfield sites. TDC should be encouraging new business to existing business parks. No development on Agricultural Land. Tendring needs to plan for right number of houses and it should include affordable housing. No infrastructure in place for Tendring Central Garden Village development such as doctors, shops and roads. Impact on fresh water – some households rely on well water. Need to protect ancient lanes and hedgerows. More effort to preserve woodlands. Option 2 might lead to duelling of A120 between Frating and Weeley. Option 3 does not match the vision for the future in any respect. Would welcome help to encourage progress for broadband in Gt Bromley. Option 3 wont attract Doctors etc. too small to be properly serviced. Seaside traffic congestion on A120 during summer months. Option 3 suggested advantages is the employment and job opportunities in the commercial part of the development. No rail link in Gt Bromley. Public bus services is sparse and inadequate. New business park in Gt Bromley goes against TDCs suggested and existing policies. High proportion of commuters are likely to use Manningtree Station traveling via Lt Bromley. Parking for commuters at Manningtree Station is already at capacity. Option 1, 2 and 4 - Employment identified in namely Harwich and Clacton more suitable for housing taking into account rail links. The scale of Option 3 will have a detrimental effect on surrounding areas and village identity will be lost. Gt Bromley Primary School is successful, highly regarded and already well subscribed. How would it cope with additional children? if a community facility is built what will happens to our much loved Village Hall? Regeneration and growth should be the main priority in the coastal areas. Options 1 and 2 Clacton and Weeley seem more favourable in term of current infrastructure, not such a loss of character and lower agricultural land being lost to development. Large development on greenfield land is not likely to be popular, sustainable or be good for the district in any location. The Parish Council feels that an Option 4 is a better option to a limited extend to maintain quality of life in these towns. The Parish Council suggests Option 5 which is a mix of affordable and market housing in every rural community say on average 5 or 6 per year. This will manage additional growth. Option 3 isn't very favourable. It is debatable whether a larger development is needed in Tendring in the current planning cycle. Even if it is needed the Option 3 is certainly not a sustainable option. The new Local Plan should focus more on affordable housing in the rural area

Little Bentley Parish Council

- The Parish Council is confident that Option 3 Tendring Central Garden Village will be thoroughly discredited due to its lack of sustainability, lack of relationship to Tendring housing and employment needs. Option 3 is not considered to provide a sustainable option for Tendring's future growth. Little Bentley Parish Council does not have firm views on alternative growth options, but would expect that growth attached to existing urban along with a very limited amount of further growth in rural communities would provide a logical and sustainable way forward for development.

Little Bromley Parish Council

- Support is given by the Parish Council to Option 1 and object to Tendring Central development. New development should be directed to the towns such as Clacton. Benefits of developing at Clacton are

considered, these include infrastructure improvements, education and health provision. The Parish also consider that development at Sladbury's Lane in Clacton would be an acceptable location for new housing development.

Little Bromley Parish Council

- The Parish Council supports Option 1 and objects to Option 3. New development should be directed to the towns. Option 1 needs infrastructure improvements, education and health provision. The Parish Council considers that Sladbury's Lane in Clacton would be an acceptable location for new housing development.

Little Clacton Parish Council

- The Parish Council prefer Option 3 and Option 1 as their second choice. The Parish Council think that Option 2 and 4 are unacceptable options. The Parish Council propose a 5th Option – North and North West of the district that will take up some of the shortfall for the extra houses. Areas in the North and North West like Harwich, Manningtree, Lawford, Horseley Cross have as good an infrastructure as Clacton. The Parish Council accept the 2014 draft, accept the extra 250 Oakwood Park development and would accept in principal a small development at Hartley Gardens which is in our parish, subject to scrutiny as long as no extra houses are added along centenary way. Buffer zone vital between Clacton and Little Clacton in keeping the village identity of Little Clacton. The Parish Council suggest that the new junior school should be developed on the Foots farm site

Little Oakley Parish Council

- Should focus on inward investment and tourism for Harwich. The Local Plan should concentrate building homes where infrastructure e.g. schools etc is already in place or can be easily improved. Rural areas suffer from poor infrastructure e.g. broadband, utilities, doctor surgeries and also suffer from surface water flooding. SUDS should be designed so that when there is a low rainfall, they do not become a health hazard and when there is high rainfall they need to be able to handle the amount of rain. The Parish Council have concerns that the flood assessment risk maps may be incomplete and feel that this should be thoroughly investigated. The Parish Council support Option 2 as it is a central location, already has council offices, crematorium, better infrastructure, railway station. The Parish Councils second choice is Option 1, third choice is Option 3 and they are against Option 4. Horsley cross should be considered

Manningtree Town Council

- There are a large number of new properties proposed in Lawford and Mislay compared to the rest of the Tendring area. Traffic congestion will increase, Manningtree railway station will be affected, concern regarding the condition of the local roads

Mistley Parish Council

- All the options for the provision of the housing shortfall have disadvantages. Extending Clacton means that people will be further from centres of retail and other amenities requiring the use of private vehicles etc. Option 2 has a railway station which is important and will open up options for future Local plans. More sustainable infrastructure, good transport links including railway, a central location in the whole area, a distinctive place on its own, closely linked to other mainly urban areas. Option 4 against strongly as it would lead to the destruction of openness. Important to provide housing that will enable families to keep together in a locality. Should be a housing mix. Limited

amount of brownfield sites should be emphasised as their use is often put forward by opponents to the use of greenfield. Use of satellite clinics would be beneficial especially for remote locations. No mention of provision for education at sixth form level especially as its compulsory to stay in education till 18. Issue of the A137 rail crossing at Manningtree railway station is made urgent as the Babergh housing in East Bergholt and Brantham will add more pressure on this pinch point and limited parking spaces.

Ramsey and Parkeston Parish Council

- The Parish Council Prefer Option 3 as the infrastructure is already in place. Request made to withdraw 2 sites from the proposed local plan – Land South of Ramsey Road, Ramsey and Land West of Mayes Lane, Ramsey. Duelling of the A120 corridor leading to Harwich has been proposed over the last 30 years with no real guarantee of being put in place.

St Osyth Parish Council

- Option 3 is the preferred option. Top priority for the local plan should be: creating conditions of economic growth and creating new jobs. Concerned that large scale developments should be proportional against the provision of roads, shops etc to ensure that the district does not have a plethora of new homes without the required infrastructure. Wish to see conditions imposed on developers to ensure that the provision of infrastructure, especially roads, occur at the beginning of any new development. An industrial/business park should be developed at Horsley Cross to maximise the use of A120. Service industry could be maximised as 75% of the working age population of Tendring travelling outside of the district on a daily basis. Business rates should be addressed. Public transport and the provision of a decent road system is important to encourage industry into the area. Questions the number of houses needed and the 'growth rate' on which is assessed. The provision of homes for residents of the district should be the priority. Should not become an 'overspill' for London. Local plan should provide affordable housing and employment opportunities. It should 'dovetail' into other plans such as Essex Highways etc. Agrees that the Local Plan will be critical for making sure that the district has the right infrastructure in Tendring to accommodate the new jobs and homes needed in future. Mix of houses should be diverse to provide enough affordable housing. The development of brownfield sites should be actioned before any agricultural land is used. Parish Council agree with the vision of the future of Tendring as set out in the Local Plan. The need for housing must be justified and should support a growth in employment opportunities, as opposed to being built simply to act as a 'London suburb'.

Thorrington Parish Council

- Focus on the issue of affordable housing to enable the children of local families to remain local, otherwise there will be even more of a skew in the population to the older/retired. Health consideration should be given to the impact on rural communities of consolidation into 'super surgeries' when public transport is poor – high risk of elderly becoming isolated. Transport needs to be sustainable. Utilities need to be taken into consideration e.g. mobile phone signal and broadband. Option 4 is the realistic option in terms of infrastructure/investment needed to deliver. Option 1 has been put forward which acknowledges it would result in saturation has to beg the question as to whether the district really needs these houses at all. The Parish Council has suggested an alternative option of smaller developments as infill in the villages as and when proposed. No additional developments but reconsider the assumptions which have led to the current projections as to need.

Thorpe-Le-Soken Parish Council

- Concerns were raised in regard to infrastructure provision. Issues in regard to traffic and congestion. Concerns in regard to sewage and sewers in the high street. Significant impact on healthcare and education facilities. Concerns in regard to public transport. It was considered that the plan should promote employment in the area. The Parish also raised concerns in regard to the coalescence of villages. The Parish Council have already taken on its share of development.

Weeley Parish Council

- Large scale development within the parish boundary is inappropriate for a number of reasons. There are areas in the district where additional employment opportunities are to be welcomed and other areas where employment is of lesser importance due to the make-up of the population. In Weeley where there is a high percentage of economically inactive residents with a high number of pensioner households would suggest that creating jobs in the village is of lesser importance. New houses should be located in areas that already have a balanced mixture of ages. Tending is primarily an agricultural and tourism based area and concentration should not be taken on offshore renewable energy and the care sector. Concentrate in the tourism qualities of the peninsula and protect the traditional agricultural nature of Tendring. The new houses should support the TDC's Economic Development Strategy 2013 which highlights the growth locations around Harwich, Clacton and Colchester. Council needs to be more proactive when dealing with current unemployment levels. Housing numbers should be based on a study of this area and not nationwide needs. Not enough current provision of roads, buses and train services and no plans to increase this in the future. If the main driver for housing need is the continued migration of older people, why should the top priority be to create conditions for economic growth and new jobs. Support should be made for local businesses. Weeley already has a high number of vacant homes. There is no GP surgery in Weeley. The A133 should be a dual carriageway from the A120 at Frating to Weeley and beyond to Clacton. The railway station at Weeley is underused. Only 5.3% of people travel by rail. Improvements in infrastructure are needed. Critical to keep greenbelt and vital agricultural land with building in countryside kept to a minimum. There would be a disproportionate impact on villages from any large developments. Options of growth should be concentrated on areas such as, Harwich and Dovercourt, Manningtree/Mistley and the Lawford area and Frating due to the good transport links and better train service. Weeley Parish Council questioned the housing requirements in justifying a 'Garden village' and had concerns over the exact location.

Wrabness Parish Council

- The Parish Council are alarmed at the number of new houses proposed for the District, which accelerates new house building beyond previous trends. The Parish Council agree the emphasis of new housing development should be at towns and larger settlements. The Parish Council are worried about pressure for housing development in smaller villages which is currently way beyond anything previously experienced. Liaise with infrastructure providers to identify the current shortcomings and improvement necessary to support growth in the District. The Parish Council recommend that the open countryside and the most productive agricultural land is protected from development. The Parish Council agree the emphasis of new housing should be at towns and larger settlements which have a good range of services

Residents Groups

Parkeston Welfare Park and Residents Association

- Concerns regarding Education. Concerns regarding Medical facilities. Concerns regarding Police and Fire Services. Concerns regarding Water pressure. Concerns regarding traffic and parking. There are concerns over the proposed housing developments due to the big percentage of unemployment.

Kirby Residents Association- Ray Enever

- Concerns regarding infrastructure. Concerns regarding the green gaps. Concerns regarding London overspill.

Tendring Against Overdevelopment

- The proposed Rouses Farm development is seriously flawed because the road infrastructure falls short of that needed to support such a development. Suggestion of a new link road linking Broklands with St Johns Road then linking to the A133 this could support more housing and would make it more viable for shops and larger better equipped medical facilities. Although against development, a larger development has the potential to be more successful than several piecemeal developments. Concerns regarding the use of Jaywick Lane by any new development at Rouses Farm

Tendring Green Allotments Association

- Two areas designated for green infrastructure (PEO19) in the draft local plan and request for another piece of land to be considered. Currently being used as allotments and local green space.

Walton on Naze, Frinton-on-sea, Kirby Cross & Thorpe-Le-Soken Rail Users Association

- Public transport alternative to private car. Will work to improve facilities for passengers at railway stations, bus stops etc. Encourage increased capacity, frequency of services, explore opportunities to improve or expand the existing rail network to meet the needs of the growing population. Important that any land along the rail corridors is kept for: future options for insertion of park and ride facilities or bus interchange and passenger car parking at many stations, future expansion at existing stations such as addition of stabling sidings or extra or longer platforms, Future addition of double tracking/connecting curves etc, Future insertion of freight stabling sidings and transfer facilities, new stations at Gorse Lane Gt Clacton and Essex University Campus Wivenhoe, Potential re-opening of closed stations and lines

Protect Great Bentley

- Prefer Option 1 Hartley Garden Suburb – near to existing infrastructure and has potential growth. It will cause the least damage to the rural heartland of the District. Object – Option 3 Tendring Central Garden Village – not a sustainable development idea as there are not any amenities in place locally. This would be expensive to put into place. TDC need to concentrate on what makes sense for the long term. Infrastructure of the local plan is the first priority. Need to ensure commitments to funding are put into place and education/transport/health amenities are assured before any development takes place. Infrastructure has to be provided for a sustainable drainage system for the district which is low lying, possesses a high water table in places, has low soil gradients which do not assist drainage and is close to the sea. Building developments on greenfield sites would lead to further

loss of habitat – have impact on wildlife and conservation areas and contribute to increased flood risk. Do not allow development on Grade 1 or 2 arable land. Ensure conservation areas are properly protected. Give consideration to areas which have previously provided habitats for rare species and develop a program for reintroducing and properly protecting those species. Any developments in the districts larger villages should be proportionate to their current size and infrastructure capacity so as not to change their distinct ‘village characteristics’. Tendring must not become a District of interlinked towns. Villages must be allowed to remain villages to ensure we have a variety of lifestyles across the District. As there is an ageing population there should be greater emphasis on ensuring public transport is ‘elderly friendly’. This should include policy which ensures all of our villages have adequate and regular bus services to the main towns and facilities to ensure the elderly do not become isolated. Expand Sustainable Construction to require renewable energy systems incorporated into all new builds.

The Wivenhoe Society

- Issue 6 – Options for Growth – the document doesn’t identify the cross border development as one of the 4 options. The merits of this proposal need to be considered against the alternatives including option 2, expansion at Weeley. The proposed site does not have a railway station – Weeley however does have a rail service. Already close to a link to the A120. A gradual expansion of existing Tendring communities including Weeley would present fewer transitional problems.

Wivenhoe Neighbourhood Plan Group

- The proposal for an extra 2000 homes between the east side of Colchester and Elmstead Market appears in all 4 options presented by TDC and therefore does not really represent an option at all. Joint proposal between Colchester Borough Council (CBC) and TDC with 1000 homes contributing to the target housing requirement of each Council. Greater priority has to be given to the building of schools and medical facilities at an early stage. Should expand the number of dwellings in Weeley and make Weeley a key commuter station. Need to provide excellent parking facilities and a fast train service to main stations Colchester, Chelmsford, Stratford and London. Confirmation required that a link road between the A133 and A120 will be built as part of the proposed scheme before houses are constructed. Should do more to preserve the feelings of entering the countryside when leaving Greenstead roundabout. Plant trees and bushes along the A133 north side between Greenstead and Elmstead Market to benefit the wildlife.

Frating Parish Council - residents Against New Town

- Concerns regarding medical facilities. Concerns regarding employment. Concerns regarding schools. Concerns regarding transport issues. Concerns regarding High grade Agricultural Land. Lots of lower grades around Clacton and Harwich both have rail links. Concerns regarding urbanisation

Other Groups

Little Dragons Pre-School (Gt Bromley)

- Close working relationship with the community and children. Increased traffic level – concerned about the safety of children– children walk to and from preschool as well as the walks we do around the village. Beautiful rural setting – shame to lose this privilege. If a new school/preschool was to open it would impact on Little Dragons. Charity run preschool and part of the community – object strongly to anything that would threaten that and the service we offer to our children. Location of the

development is non-sustainable - no rail links and very few bus services. People will rely on cars which goes against TDC's own planning policies of 'delivering sustainable development'. The development would create traffic which would cause pollution. The area would become unhealthy and the safety of young children and families who attend the Pre School will decrease. Development would cause irreversible damage to the character of the village and surrounding areas. Strongly against the urbanisation of rural communities. Great Bromley is not a sustainable location with no train station or suitable public transport. Increasing the village would not benefit the community and maintain its rural character. The local services would not cope with the increased population. The vast underground water catchment needs to be protected and protect the water needs. Local Green Gaps need to be maintained as important open spaces between the towns and villages to prevent them from merging. It was considered that any further development within the locality would damage the character of the village and call into question the commercial viability of the school. Concerns were raised in regard to the sustainability of the Tendring Central development. Concerns in regard to traffic generation and congestion caused by new development which will impact on staff and parents of the school. Impacts of health by increase traffic. Concerns that the school would not have capacity for new development. The pre-school was preferable to a commercial nursery by parents due to its smaller size which would be damaged should the Tendring Central development take place. Development on greenfield land would go against the Council's own planning policies.

Campaign against urban sprawl in Essex (CAUSE) – Rosie Pearson (Secretary)

- Welcomes the emphasis on jobs. Would like to see a greater emphasis on integrating the planning of employment, housing and transport. Pleased to see the ability to plan across district boundaries and asks the councils to take an integrated approach to delivery of a plan for housing and transport based around the two enterprise zones. Agree strongly that a stronger link between Tendring and Colchester is essential and building on the strengths of the University of Essex to explore the opportunity for major development crossing the Tendring/Colchester boundary. Considers that Tendring should embrace sub-regional growth as an opportunity to enhance local economies and facilities. It should be planned according to the principles of accessibility by the sustainable transport modes. The upshot would be to promote larger scale economic growth based on the underused railway asset. Tendring should not focus on the narrow issue of whether housing numbers count towards Colchester or Tendring requirements. Cautiously encourage the formation of a joint delivery vehicle bringing together the two Boroughs, the University, the Landowners and the other interested parties. Important to promote housing that is well related to jobs and services and served by public transport to ensure sustainable patterns of development, the under-utilised Colchester – Clacton railway line offers the scope for a sustainable and integrated solution. Strongly supports Tendring's commitment to work with Colchester in planning for growth to the east of Colchester. The underused transport infrastructure gives rise to significant opportunity to promote more sustainable patterns of development. This has not been fully addressed in the Issues and Options document. Housing development should be focused on existing stations and therefore reduce the impact of new development on the road network. A new University Station and the potential of the Harwich Branch should be considered. The recently appointed CAUSE specialist rail consultant has provided early indications that the railway line has enormous potential for a sustainable solution to the districts growth with better rail services integrated with bus services. Colchester and Tendring are highly car-dependent and there should be a strong emphasis on reversing this trend by providing opportunity to plan for the provision of cycle ways, footpaths and fast, frequent and affordable public transport. The possible vision for Tendring should not be to consider Tendring in isolation and should be taken further as a vision for the wider North Essex area. A strong vision can result in integrated planning and address the concerns of residents. This should also include a local delivery body to bring

together interested parties to promote and co-ordinate the housing growth needed. Strongly concerned that the Vision statement currently omits the Colchester Fringe. No strategy has been developed where the submitted sites would match the transport strategy. Concern that the proposal for 2000 homes split between the two authorities may not be sufficient enough to deliver the necessary infrastructure required to support the new community. Options 1-3 for new “garden suburbs/villages” are not related to the railway and so less sustainable in transport terms. An over-emphasis on house price differentials and the resulting differences in the ability to fund infrastructure is constraining the Council.

Cllr Barrie Cook JP (Colchester Borough Council)

- Concerns regarding the proposed east Colchester housing development. Required that ‘Salary Brook Valley’ remains undeveloped. The reasons given for this include biodiversity of the area, access to green space for the public and to preserve a ‘green boundary’ between Colchester and Tendring. It was also considered that there is land elsewhere within the district that could accommodate growth; however the setting of the rural villages should be protected.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Two thirds of the representations received were from members of the public. At the time of writing Officers were compiling these comments meaning that no formal results of the formal public representations can be reported to Members at this stage. However, some commentary can be given in regard to the exhibition events which took place during the public consultation period.

The consultation period started on 1st September and ran to the 13th October, during that time officers held 7 public exhibitions and 1 public meeting across the district. In all, 940 people attended the exhibitions and meeting.

As part of the Issues and Options process the Council leafleted every household across the district to make the public aware of the forthcoming consultation events. The leaflets were sent out during mid-August and early September together with Electoral Roll Canvass material.

Venue and Date	Time	No. of attendees
Pier Avenue Baptist Church, Clacton. Saturday 5 th Sept	10am-3pm	141
Council Chamber, Weeley Monday 7 th Sept	10am-9pm	284
Park Pavilion, Dovercourt Monday 14 th Sept	3pm-7:30pm	51
The Venture Centre Lawford Tuesday 15 th Sept	4pm-7pm	47
The Council House, The Tringle Shopping Centre, Frinton Thursday 17 th Sept	10am-4pm	115
The School Jaywick Lane Clacton	12-30pm-4-30pm	105

Saturday 19 th Sept		
Great Bromley Village Hall Wednesday 23 rd Sept	5-30pm-8-30pm	177

A public meeting was held at Ramsey Village Hall 7th October - 10 people attended

Within the exhibitions presented by the officers (referred to above), members of the public were asked to give advantages and disadvantages to each of the four options. Post-it notes were provided and members of the public were free to make any comments they felt were relevant to that option. A complete list of all issues raised by this exercise can be found at Appendix A2(a). Where an issue was repeated, this was not noted more than once. This list gives Members an understanding of all issues raised by the public at the exhibitions.

To help Members understand the key issues from each option, officers have taken note of those issues that were commonly made at the exhibitions.

Option 1 – Members of the public broadly considered that this option benefited from having good infrastructure including road links and good access to employment. The disadvantages of this option included; lack of employment and lack of regeneration for Jaywick. Problems regarding traffic, Healthcare and education were also noted. It was also considered that there were too many homes proposed in this locality.

Option 2 – It was generally considered by members of the public that the only advantages for this option were good infrastructure including railways. Disadvantages included; lack of employment and transport and impact on healthcare and traffic generation. Some people commented that this option was the closest to Footh Farm, which was considered to be a disadvantage.

Option 3 – Advantages for this option included; the location of development close to Colchester and good road and rail connections. This option had a number of disadvantages attributed to it by members of the public. These included; lack of infrastructure, employment, medical facilities, schools and shops. Concerns were also raised in regard to the traffic generated and the dangerous junction at Frating. Loss of agricultural land was also raised as a concern as well as flooding and the assertion that the area of land is located on an underground lake.

Option 4 – The public considered that the advantages for this option included the used less agricultural land as compared to other options and that there would be better job opportunities within this option. Disadvantages included the lack of medical facilities and employment and traffic issues.

These results only give Members a snapshot of what people wrote at the exhibitions. A number of people commented that there were 'no advantages' to a specific option or that a certain option was the 'best option', but no reason was given for this. These comments are difficult to report to Members and so have been omitted.

Appendix A2(a) - Issues and Options Public Consultations

Option 1: Hartley Gardens Suburb: A major development on greenfield land in north-west Clacton;

Advantages

- Ideal with the new road – replace the existing bad bends
- Good idea if Little Clacton/Clacton proposals are not built
- Already has the infrastructure – railway link, bus services – where the investment and employment is needed.
- Existing infrastructure – good choice
- Near existing facilities
- Within the envelope of Clacton
- Most sustainable
- Better to restrict development to the fringes of existing urban centres
- New job opportunities regarding school/community facilities
- Current public transport
- Putting money into a more deprived area
- More homeless demand
- I believe that option 1 is the best option given that this is a run down area this would improve the area.
- Helps to control Clacton's growing population
- Clacton is already a town whereas others are not

Disadvantages

- Will social housing overflow?
- Lack of facilities
- Few job prospects
- Loss of farmland
- Too much congestion
- No schools
- No surgeries
- Not enough transport
- A133 carriageway – how will this cope with all the traffic?
- Clacton hospital to run as a full hospital like Colchester
- Over populated – can't accommodate for the people currently in Clacton
- Need to sort out the social problems before thinking about bringing in more people
- Little parking at Weeley train station
- Sewage treatment in urban development seems bizarre
- Unaffordable homes for young adults to stay in villages where they grew up.
- Need to ensure that GP's will come to the area to live and to work before building new homes
- Need to ensure that adequate policing is in force. Currently have the threat that the Police Station will close. This could lead to increased crime levels as PCSO's do not have arresting powers.
- Houses should be for local people and not as a London overspill for all their problems
- Few bus services, especially if you want to go to the theatre
- Local infrastructure will not be able to cope: Trains 1 per hour and Buses 2 per hour of which many unfit for purpose

- Shopping facilities will not be adequate
- Build the houses on the outskirts of Clacton
- The new homes look as though they would do away with meadow view Mobile Park homes?
- Build bungalows for the elderly
- Issues with traffic at Weeley roundabout and Frating roundabout
- What about Jaywick Regeneration as promised?
- What about public toilets closing?
- Jaywick Lane is already a very busy dangerous road!
- Cost of road improvement A133
- Our quiet village will become a town
- Development should be spread more fairly over the whole district
- Need real salaried jobs and not 0 hour contracts
- Bulldoze Jaywick and re-develop there
- How will the new development impact upon the A133, A120 and A12
- A combination likely to destroy Clacton's tourist industry by increase in traffic
- Loss of Greenbelt
- Huge impact on existing residents
- Costs involved in the new road
- No public transport in Jaywick Lane
- There are already 900 homes planned for the back of Jaywick Lane and 240 on the corner of Rush Green Road – the roads can't take the extra traffic
- Roads are already in a bad state and need to be repaired
- There is a school there which isn't being use
- Will decrease value of existing properties
-

Option 2: Weeley Garden Village: A new settlement to be built on greenfield land around the A133 at Weeley

Advantages

- Good idea – a whole new community like to Welwyn Garden City
- Building homes with the infrastructure required at the same time
- Nearer to Colchester for work and hospital
- Need to use a combination of Option 2 and 3 providing balanced rural development
- Little impact on current housing
- If facilities are provided it could enhance Weeley as a community that would be a small town rather than a village.
- Will make more use of Weeley rail station- could become a transport hub. Need the trains to stop more at Weeley. Good links to London and Clacton for work opportunities.
- Mix of starter and sheltered/assisted living would provide improvement to the area
- It has a shop, school, train station and good roads
- More road usage on local roads, B1414, B1033 and B1441
- Less bottle necks to rest of the area
- Existing roads and facilities
- Plenty of transport links
- Benefits local area
- Attraction of more amenities and transport links will encourage families

- High standard of local schools and nurseries in place will attract families and working age.
- Weeley would benefit a new infrastructure to its good but dated look.
- Encourage younger families to move to the area with affordable housing in a commuting area.
- Best area for sustainable development whilst building on existing infrastructure.
- Restricted local employment will need good rail link therefore best option
- Fill homeless need
- Need for more new homes
- School could be expanded and railway station and a shop and bakery.
- Good existing infrastructure – by road and rail
- Transport in place near to sewage plant

Disadvantages

- Why not do some of Option 2 and 3
- Build Bungalows
- People will expect buses 24/7 and free
- Not much to do socially
- Lack of rail service and rail fares too expensive. One train an hour will not change – so how will train links improve?
- Long wait for hospital appointments
- Increased gateway to coastal towns
- Will be DHSS overflow
- Weeley is a village – it's not meant to be another Town we are over populated!
- Need better facilities and larger school
- Doctor Surgeries and Hospitals struggling to cope
- Surely any development should be built nearer jobs towards Colchester, Ipswich and Londoner the roads are blocked in rush hour now
- Over breeding
- Build a new development between St Osyth and Jaywick
- Gridlock on A133
- Needs to improve the bus service – limited evening and bus services
- Planners and the plan cannot deliver the school or medical facilities
- Loss of Green Gaps and Agricultural land
- Road connections e.g. the neighbouring village –Great Bentley being a rat run for road traffic A133 and Heckford's Road and Plough Road
- Local and Holiday traffic already cause roads to clog up. These roads cannot take any more traffic.
- More high end jobs are needed
- A12 needs to become M12
- Train journey of under 1 hour to London
- Hospital should be provided now not after the new developments
- No employment in Weeley village and most workers will have to commute adding to the gridlock every morning and evening between Clacton and Frating.
- B1033 from Walton, Frinton, Kirby, Weeley plus A133 to Frating is congested all day, every day especially in the summer
- Elderly isolated due to lack of transport links
- Would young families be able to live here?

- Parts of Weeley don't have main drainage (certainly near this site) – how will this problem be overcome?
- Create a new village, maybe Horsley Cross away from existing housing and future developments to pay for infrastructure
- Developers do not build properties for people on benefits
- All roads already congested at school times and going to and from work.
- No parking at the railway station
- Colchester hospital can't cope
- The number of houses planned do not add up to what Carswell stated
- Where are the secondary schools?
- No Sunday train service. Great Abellio won't increase the service
- Visual impact of large development on land
- Village school is already full
- Lack of local jobs – building houses for commuters
- Complete urbanisation of the area
-

Option 3: Tendring Central Garden Village: A new settlement to be built on greenfield land around the A120 at Frating

Advantages

- Best option for people to access main roads to get to Colchester and London
- Taking further development away from the coastal areas. Less traffic being pushed into Clacton, Frinton etc
- New road connections
- May attract new business imports/exports through Harwich and provide jobs.
- On A120 Junction
- Transport links make it more viable
- Easier for job opportunities, hospitals, educational facilities nearby
- Closer to Colchester hospital
- Minimal impact on current housing
- Already a large business development
- There is already a bridge over the A120 here that goes nowhere. There has been left space for slip roads. Clearly this was meant for future development and is the obvious place to build a new 'garden village'.
- It would be good to build retirement homes so that larger homes could be freed for families or re development
- Will this provide affordable rented accommodation?
- Better travelling access for work
- Takes pressure off of A133 compared to option 1 and 2
- Will this development replace development around Clingo hill

Disadvantages

- Colchester hospital can't cope. How's it going to cope with 30,000-40,000 population explosion
- Will buses improve?
- The junction off the A120 (Car auction roundabout) needs to be sorted. In rush hour this is awful

- Still not sustainable –water table/long term buses guaranteed
- Loss of agricultural land
- Was thrown out last time and should be again
- Who are the houses for? Not more 'imports' only cause trouble
- Area of Thorpe Road already has too much traffic. Family homes could add up to 4 cars per household
- Less Police here – more trouble in last few years
- Infrastructure doesn't hold up now – sewers, schools, ambulance services etc
- How will this affect the employment situations?
- Roads need to be improved to take heavier traffic flow
- Impact on aquifer where properties in Ravens Green get water
- Loss of a large area of grade 1 + 2 agricultural land
- Traffic and congestion for commuting/travel is already a nightmare at A120
- Shame to damage a greenfield site
- No rail link with Colchester and mainline – any commuters will have to use Great Bentley or Manningtree – insufficient parking
- Great Bentley already suffers with through traffic – this will only make things worse
- Destruction of best grade farmland
- No sewage drainage
- Medical centre? What will be the scope of care?
- No demand for industrial site. Still over capacity at Gorse Lane and Horsley Cross not developed.
- This site was thrown out by the inspector in 2004 – what a waste of tax payers money to bring this plan back again
- When it rains hard – it floods the drains in people's gardens.
- A new out of town unemployment office
- You have not identified Great Bromley. Therefore cannot gauge the effect of this proposal. Is this a consultation?
- The 'Oasis' development contains in its surrounding forest areas, badgers, owls, barn owls and other rare wildlife that would be lost forever for the sake of greedy landowners.
- Crockleford and Salary Brook is a lovely recreational area and I would be sorry to see it built over
- Is this driven by local landowner greed?
- Anglian water would need to build a new larger pumping station
- Nearest train station is Alresford which has no access to 'fast' rail services
- Clingo hill traffic will be a nightmare
- This housing proposal is on my land I have never seen or heard from anyone in connection with this.
- Loss of peace and quiet and building noise, lorries etc for years to come – sounds travel very far
- Entrance via Tokely Road is dangerous
- Loss of wildlife
- Moved to Great Bromley for a reason – lovely village, not enough school, transport rubbish, no doctors, accident on A120
- Infrastructure/roads problems
- Flooding problems adjacent to Tokely Road
- No infrastructure exists for this
- Extra housing no extra road, no secondary school
- Destruction of farmland/loss of arable land
- Will ruin countryside

- Existing expansion means lack of schools, doctors, surgeries, local jobs
- Infrequent public transport
- How many of proposed homes will be affordable to local residents
- Impact on natural habitat and wildlife – buzzards nesting
- Previous plans were rejected – no gas supply
- Nothing has changed since added traffic problems – Clingoe Hill and A120
- Not sustainable
- Real impact on the physical, mental and emotional well being of the established residents
- No direct transport links – can't get anywhere without a car
- No railway infrastructure,
- Loss of another rural village
- No demand locally for extra housing
- Housing numbers are unlikely to deliver any positive benefits
- Create rat runs to Great Bentley station, shops and services
- Safety concerns with increase traffic and already determined 'accident blackspot'
- The additional cost of new infrastructure defeats the premise of low cost housing. These will become mid to high cost.
- Frating roundabout and A120 slip road, already traffic bottleneck
- Urbanisation of a very rural area
- Prime greenfield areas being used and will be forever lost to future generations
- Health fears from the 'industrial area'
- Too close to Colchester Fringe Development
- Loss of identity for the 4 separate parishes
- It is said that there is an underground lake in this area with subsequent flooding and sewerage problems to some houses
- Loss of rural community
- Poor internet
- Road safety issues at Kings Arms cross roads
- Do not want it!
- It will ruin what is a very nice area. House prices will reduce
- Crazy idea
- Serious lack of amenities would put off young families
- If I wanted to live in a town I would have moved to one!
- Need play areas
- Other more suitable sites especially for industry
- Empty industrial estates all over Colchester

Option 4: Higher Urban Densities: House building at a higher density in and around our towns to reduce the amount of greenfield land needed for development in other locations

Advantages

- No farmland taken out of use
- Nearer to all facilities
- Good rail and bus services therefore less impact on roads
- Good idea if green space is included and if brownfield sites can be made available at reasonable cost

- Homes would be cheaper so more locals would afford to stay in them
- Suggest low rise flats with access to allotments
- Saves agricultural land
- Avoids bungalow sprawl
- Building houses near to industrial areas, measures are need to reduce pollution/smells from the factories
- Close proximity to the A120, Colchester and the University
- More affordable housing
- Would provide more local job opportunities
- It keeps building maintenance workers busy, more people spending money in the town
- There are single people and one parent families who need smaller properties
- Put yellow lines in Thorpe and you won't get a bottleneck
- At least will 'share' the burden around – homes have to go somewhere – but new roads etc will need to build at what cost?
- Plenty of areas which need development will enhance current plans and use existing rail and bus links
- Better connection to what already is a town
- Better job opportunities in Colchester
- Better connections to London
- Existing infrastructure, public transport/amenities already in place.
- More job opportunities
- Avoids using greenbelt land which should be protected for agriculture/wildlife
- Use existing brownfield sites to expand to meet natural population growth.
- Creating what in effect is a new town, uses up vital greenbelt land

Disadvantages

- Building just for the after effects of immigration
- Colchester hospital can't cope now
- Roads need to be better
- Doctors? Jobs? Undesirables? Sewage? Drainage?
- New homes now are too small so making them even smaller would not work. Parking is a problem
- Infrastructure needs radical improvement
- Clacton needs jobs
- Train services need improving – more than 1 per hour
- Need to ensure that gas/water and electricity can cope with additional properties
- Where are people coming from to take up the new homes?
- Farm land being built on- cannot be replaced
- Riding school closure with disability facilities gone
- People don't want smaller homes and gardens
- Not enough bungalows
- Lack of local transport
- Public services are currently in adequate
- A120 is too narrow to take more traffic for Harwich
- Agricultural land built on = less food, more food imports. New agricultural land = depleted forest etc = less wildlife which could be important.
- Smaller properties will end up as buy to let with inevitable consequences

- Social issues with increased densities
- Traffic in Colchester already a nightmare – is getting so to leave Colchester
- 30 dwellings per hectare are not homes they are tomorrows slums
- Loss of character to villages
- Pressure on the underpass on the A137 at Manningtree station
- Creating ghettos for the future
- Doctor appointments quite scarce, with 600 more people this will make it decrease
- Scale and appearance not in keeping with the area
- Redeveloping 'Brownfield sites' in Clacton needs to be looked at e.g. Council depots, derelict railway land and run down housing
- Concerned about the social issues which could be attracted to the high density areas and the limited social groups that choose this type of area
- Harwich has many empty properties
- Ramsey area is supposed to be rural with no ribbon development. This would turn Ramsey into a continuation of Dovercourt. Issues with sewerage and also flooding
- Villages will disappear within developments
- Walton – on –the –Naze doesn't have enough infrastructure or sewage facilities to cater for excessive houses

'Proposed option 5' – Spread the load across Tendring in villages as necessary – Small developments

APPENDIX 6: Report to Local Plan Committee 3 November 2016

LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE

3 NOVEMBER 2016

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING

A.1 2016 LOCAL PLAN PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE SUMMARY

(Report prepared by Simon Meecham)

PART 1 – KEY INFORMATION

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

To provide the Local Plan Committee with a summary of the consultation responses received by Tendring District Council and update on the position in regards to the Objectively Assessed Needs.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Tendring District Council, Preferred Options Local Plan consultation took place from 14 July 2016 to 8 September 2016 so that technical stakeholders, businesses, developers and landowners, community representatives and members of the public could comment on the draft policies and the policies maps. The draft Local Plan was supported with Sustainability Appraisals and these have also been out to public consultation, Part 1: 8 August to 19 September 2016 and Part 2: 28 August to 10 October 2016.

The representations received vary from suggested amendments to wording, through to full support of policies or full objections to policies. Representations also included proposals for additional sites for housing and/or employment growth or updates to sites already part of Tendring District Council's Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment document.

Any proposed changes to the Preferred Options Local Plan to create the Submission version of the Local Plan will be presented to another meeting of this Committee.

The comments and changes put forward as representations address Part 1 and Part 2 of the Preferred Options Local Plan and the supporting Sustainability Appraisal. This report provides a summary of those representations. The representations can be viewed on the Council's website.

On 21 January 2016 this Committee approved the following resolution:

That the Local Plan Committee:

- b) approves that the range of Objectively Assessed Needs for Tendring District Council is 500-600 dwellings per annum; that the mid-point of 550 dwellings per annum is used as the

Council's provisional housing target for the Local Plan and that officers consider options up to 600 dwellings per annum as the Local Plan refines through its next consultation stage and new data is assessed;

On 9 June 2016, this Committee approved the locations for the supply of the Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) of 550 homes each and the location for the supply of the additional potential needs of up to 600 homes each year for public consultation.

On 27 September 2016, this Committee was informed that the Office for National Statistics had published new population projections and the Government had used those to create new household projections. Committee was informed that the Council's evidence needed to be updated to reflect the data and that Peter Brett Associates had been appointed to advise the Council on any changes to Tendring's housing requirements and that, if available, this would be presented to the meeting of the Local Plan Committee in November 2016.

Whilst the (OAN) report update has not been finalised at the time of writing this Committee report, it has been confirmed by Peter Brett Associates that Tendring can proceed on the basis of the lower of the range of housing requirements, at 550 homes each year.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Local Plan Committee:

- 1) Notes that the consultation responses for Part 1 of the Preferred Options will be jointly collated by Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Councils to jointly consider whether any necessary changes are to be proposed, which will be presented to the next meeting of this Committee;**
- 2) agrees that if the final report, expected in November 2016, from Peter Brett Associates on Tendring District Council's Objectively Assessed Needs confirms 550 homes each year as the Council's annualised housing requirement, the Head of Planning Services is authorised to proceed with Option T and not Option W in respect of allocations in Weeley in the draft Pre-Submission Local Plan;**
- 3) notes that the representations received in response to the consultation on Part 2 of the Preferred Options Draft Local Plan will be considered by the Head of Planning and any minor changes will be presented in the pre-submission draft to the Local Plan Committee on 19 January 2017 for consideration and approval; and**
- 4) requests that when considering the representations received, the Head of Planning Services consults the Local Plan Committee on major changes or those matters which have been highlighted by the Committee during its debate, prior to presenting the pre-submission draft at its committee on 19 January, this is to ensure that there is no further delay to the timetable.**

PART 2 – IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

DELIVERING PRIORITIES

The Local Plan helps to implement place shaping priorities in the Corporate Plan 2016-2020 for Tendring District Council through:

- Community Leadership by engagement with the community and effective partnership working with technical stakeholders, developers and other interested parties;
- Health and Housing through policies that promote healthier lifestyles, a quality living environment, local regeneration and council house building; and
- Employment and Enjoyment through policies to support business growth and skill development and the protection and promotion of the natural and built environments.

The Local Plan is a project in the 2016-2020 Corporate Plan and is on target at the time of writing this report. A decision to support the recommendations in this report will demonstrate progress in the delivery of the Local Plan.

RESOURCES AND RISK

Resources: The Local Plan Committee's recommendation to Council, in consultation with Cabinet and subsequent approval by Full Council of the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation Document enabled the Council's Planning Policy Team to carry out public consultation with our local communities and liaise formally with partner organisations and infrastructure providers. The costs involved in this work are met through the agreed 'LDF Budget'.

Risks: Growth options proposed and certain policies in the consultation documents have lead to some objections and some support. A future meeting of this Committee will consider changes to the policies and policies maps; today's meeting can provide a steer on those changes. If the Local Plan is amended in response to objections, it will still need to meet the tests of soundness in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in order for the Local Plan to be adopted.

Braintree District Council and Colchester Borough Council, like Tendring, are also in the process of preparing new Local Plans to guide future development. Through a Memorandum of Cooperation, the local authorities have agreed to cooperate on strategic planning matters of cross-boundary significance, including Part 1 of this Local Plan.

The risk of not agreeing a Local Plan that will deliver sufficient housing to meet objectively assessed needs would be that it would be rejected by the Planning Inspector as being unsound, thus leaving the district vulnerable to unwanted development.

LEGAL

The planning legislation and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places Local Plans at the heart of the planning system, so it is essential that they are in place and kept up to date.

The NPPF expects Local Plans to set out a vision and a framework for the future development of the area, addressing the needs and opportunities in relation to housing, the economy, community facilities and infrastructure, as well as a basis for safeguarding the environment. They are a critical tool in guiding decisions about individual development proposals (Planning Guidance Paragraph 001 Reference ID: 12-001-20140306).

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) state that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the 'development plan' unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The statutory 'development plan' for Tendring, as it stands is the 2007 Adopted Local Plan. However, the policies and proposals in the Adopted Local Plan are increasingly out of date and cannot be afforded full weight. The NPPF states permissions should be granted in such circumstances in favour of sustainable development unless any adverse impact outweighs the benefits or other policies indicate otherwise. It is therefore essential to progress the emerging Local Plan through the stages of the plan making process and ensure it meets the requirements of national planning policy so it can become the new statutory development plan and be relied upon by the Council acting as the Local Planning Authority.

Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, places a legal duty upon local authorities and other public bodies to engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis to maximise the effectiveness of Local Plan preparation, this is known as the 'Duty to Cooperate' on strategic matters of cross-boundary significance, which includes housing supply. Before a Planning Inspector can begin the process of examining a Local Plan, they need to be satisfied, with the Council's evidence, that the local authority has demonstrated it has done everything it can to ensure effective cooperation with neighbouring authorities and other partner organisations and has sought to resolve, as far as is possible, any cross-boundary planning issues.

Section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires a local planning authority to carry out a sustainability appraisal of each of the proposals in a Local Plan during its preparation. More generally, section 39 of the Act requires that the authority preparing a Local Plan must do so "with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development".

Sustainability appraisals incorporate the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (commonly referred to as the 'Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations'), which implement the requirements of the European Directive 2001/42/EC (the 'Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive') on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment. Sustainability appraisal ensures that potential environmental effects are given full consideration alongside social and economic issues.

Part 1 and Part 2 of the Local Plan have been published for consultation pursuant to Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Local Plan is

subject to a statutory six-week public consultation period and the Sustainability Appraisals five weeks; however, the consultations were extended to eight and six weeks respectively to accommodate additional time for anyone taking summer holidays.

OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Area or Ward affected: All wards.

Consultation/Public Engagement: The Local Plan is subject to a statutory six weeks public consultation period and the Sustainability Appraisals five weeks; however, the consultations were extended to eight and six weeks respectively to accommodate additional time for anyone taking summer holidays.

PART 3 – SUPPORTING INFORMATION

CURRENT POSITION AND BACKGROUND

Tendring District Council consulted on three documents over the Summer of 2016: the Preferred Options Local Plan; the Sustainability Appraisal of the strategic policies of the Local Plan, (known as Part 1); and the Sustainability Appraisal of the Tendring District specific policies, (known as Part 2).

The Preferred Options stage of plan making, (otherwise known as Regulation 18), enables the Council to test its preferred strategy through consultation with the public, community representatives, technical stakeholders, businesses, landowners and developers.

The representations received should then be considered by the Council to identify any changes it wishes to make to the Local Plan before submitting it to government. The purpose of making any changes would be to ensure that the Local Plans policies are compliant with legislation and to resolve, where possible, objections to the Plan.

Following the closure of the consultation on the above documents, new population and household projection data has been published. This is relevant to the Council's evidence base. Initial assessment of this data by the Council's consultants indicates that it may be sufficient to make provision for 550 homes for each year of the Local plan. If confirmed, there will be an opportunity to reduce the site allocations consulted upon in the Preferred Options draft of the Local Plan.

Over 90% of the objections from members of the public concerned Weeley; whilst many accepted the need for some growth, the public considered the option for a higher level of homes in Weeley to be disproportionate growth. A report to the April 2016 Local Plan Committee agreed for consultation allocations of land for 1400 new homes in Weeley to help meet that need for 600 new dwellings per year in the district and allocations of land for only 304 to help to meet the need for 550 new dwellings per year.

CURRENT POSITION

Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN)

On 21 January 2016 this committee approved the following resolution:

That the Local Plan Committee:

b) approves that the range of Objectively Assessed Needs for Tendring District Council is 500-600 dwellings per annum; that the mid-point of 550 dwellings per annum is used as the Council's provisional housing target for the Local Plan and that officers consider options up to 600 dwellings per annum as the Local Plan refines through its next consultation stage and new data is assessed;

On 9 June 2016, this Committee approved the locations for the supply of the Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) of 550 homes each year and the location for the supply of the additional potential needs of up to 600 homes each year for public consultation.

On 27 September 2016, the Council was informed that the Office for National Statistics had published new population projections and that the Government had used those to create new household projections. The Council's evidence needs to be updated to reflect the data and Peter Brett Associates has been appointed to advise the Council on any changes to Tendring's housing requirements. If available, this will be presented to the meeting of the Local Plan Committee in November 2016.

Whilst the (OAN) report has not been finalised, at the time of writing this Committee report, Peter Brett Associates has indicated that the mid point of the range of housing requirements, at 550 homes each year is likely to be sufficient to meet the district's objectively assessed housing needs.

At the April 12, 2016 meeting of this Committee, tables presenting housing requirements, current supply and preferred options for the remaining supply of housing to meet the OAN at 550 homes each years and at 600 homes each year were approved.

Weeley had received significant interest from landowners and developers before and during the Issues and Options consultation (1 September 2015 – 13 October 2015). The communities of Weeley parish also scored highly within the settlement hierarchy given the settlements location in close proximity to the strategic road network and rail station. Together the availability of land and the sustainability of the location, two key elements of producing a sound Local Plan, resulted in public consultation on two ranges for new homes in Weeley.

At 550 homes each year 'option T' (TDC Offices 24 and Weeley South of Thorpe Road 280 - 304 homes) was approved for public consultation.

At 600 homes each year option 'W' (TDC Offices 24, Weeley south of Thorpe Road 280,

Weeley north of Thorpe Road 307 and South of Tendring Park Services 800 - 1411 homes) was approved for public consultation.

Given the advice received from Peter Brett Associates, this Committee is requested to authorise officers to move forward with option T and remove Weeley north of Thorpe Road (307 homes) and South of Tendring Park Services (800 homes) if the final report from Peter Brett Associates confirms 550 homes each year as Tendring District Council's annualised housing requirement.

The evidence base, in particular the number of extant planning permissions and the delivery of houses, will continue to develop. This will be reported to the Local Plan Committee at future meetings.

BACKGROUND

This section provides a summary of the representations received in the following order:

Local Plan Preferred Options Representations

- Technical Stakeholders
- Businesses, Landowners and Developers
- Community Representatives
- Members of the Public

Sustainability Appraisal of Part 1 Representations

Sustainability Appraisal of Part 2 Representations

Each of the Local Plan representations summaries are supported by appendices which provide a fuller account of the representations. The representations are available in full on the Council's website.

Representations have been made via the Council's on-line portal, email and in writing. While every effort has been made to include all representations in this report, if any have been overlooked to date in processing, these will be reported to the next meeting of the Local Plan Committee.

Summary of the Local Plan Preferred Options and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Responses

Tendring District Council carried out three public consultations over the summer: the Preferred Options Local Plan, the Sustainability Appraisal of Part 1 of that plan and the Sustainability Appraisal of Part 2 of that plan.

Below are summaries of the representations made on the above documents. A fuller summary of the representations are attached as appendices and the representations in full may be viewed on the Council's website.

Technical Stakeholders Representations

Representations have been received from sixteen Technical Stakeholders. Significantly, Essex County Council and Colchester Borough Council, whose support is important in demonstrating that the Council has fulfilled its 'duty to co-operate,' have both supported Tendring District Council's approach and the content of the Preferred Options Local Plan.

Suggestions have been submitted to improve policy wording, for filling evidence gaps and guidance on helping to ensure the Local Plan is sound and compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework. A fuller summary of these are available in Appendix 2 and the full representations may be viewed on the council's website.

Summary of Technical Stakeholders Representations

Anglian Water has assessed the proposed allocations in the Local Plan and provides advice on what measures will be needed for each development to accommodate foul water. Braintree District Council supports the Local Plan and the housing range tested in the preferred options. The British Naturalists' Association considers that the removal of parts of the Coastal Protection Belt has been severe and requests this local designation is reconsidered. Chelmsford City Council supports the Local Plan but request that the proposed northeast Chelmsford bypass is added to part 1 of the Local Plan.

Colchester Borough Council supports the Local Plan, but suggests it should not have included an Ordnance Survey map of the area of search for the east Colchester / west Tendring garden community. The Borough Council also considers that the indicative link road for the A120 /A133 should not have been put the Local Plan and nor should the Local Plan have cross-referenced the garden community in Part 2. Committee is asked to note that Tendring officers disagree and consider that having the area of search and an indicative link road assisted the consultation process. The Colchester Natural History Society would like to see a 1.5 km buffer from Salary Brook towards Elmstead Market. Committee is asked to note that this would impact on the amount of development that could be accommodated in the Colchester Borough within the area of search for the garden community.

The Environment Agency makes some policy improvement suggestions and notes that the next version of the Local Plan needs to be accompanied by a Habitats Regulation Assessment and a sequential test for flood risks on the sites being identified for development and the proposed Regeneration Areas. Essex County Council supports both parts 1 and 2 of the Local Plan. The County Council supports the identification of a potential A120 / A133 link road and provides detailed information on the school requirements for the preferred housing and mixed-use allocations. The County Council also provides a range of policy improvement suggestions. Committee is asked to note that a Habitats Regulation Assessment and sequential tests have been commissioned to inform the pre-submission version of the Local Plan and that the policy suggestions by the Environment Agency and Essex County Council will be considered by officers

with any proposed major changes presented to this committee at a future meeting.

Highways England welcomes the strategic approach made by the Local Plan and supports the proposed A120 and A133 link road, stating that a junction would need to be grade separated rather than a roundabout to ensure less impact on A120 movements and that a business case for the road needs to be developed and led by Essex County Council. Highways England states more emphasise needs to be placed on public transport. They also state that the developments proposed in the preferred options would not have a severe impact on the A120 except in the case of Gt Bentley. Committee is asked to note that the policy suggestions by Highways England will be considered by officers with any proposed major changes presented to this committee at a future meeting.

Historic England will submit its comments on the Local Plan before the January 2017 meeting of this committee. Royal Mail asks that the Local Plan employment policies protect its distribution centre assets, especially where new communities may be built in their vicinity. The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds makes some policy word change suggestions and an addition of Walton Mere to Table D1. The Theatres Trust requests the removal of the word 'viability' from the community facilities policy. Committee is asked to note that any policy suggestions from the organisations in this paragraph will be considered by officers any proposed major changes presented to this committee at a future meeting.

Natural England requests an objective should be added to Part 1 of the Local Plan to cover landscape and climate change. The agency also suggests a number of policy wording improvements. Network Rail makes specific comments on pedestrian and farm level crossings and the potential need to remove them to facilitate safety. The National Health Service, North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group have assessed each of the proposed allocations and suggested ways in which the developments will improve health services. The focus is on new or expanded health centres across the district providing a wider range of services than currently available locally. Committee is asked to note that the policy suggestions and infrastructure requirements will be considered by officers with any proposed major changes presented to this committee at a future meeting.

Businesses, Developers and Landowners Representations

The representations received from Businesses, Landowners and Developers in regard to the Part 1 and Part 2 Local Plans mainly promote new housing/mixed-use sites (including some sites which have previously been promoted but were not included in the Preferred Options Consultation Document). There are also representations that request changes to housing/mixed-use sites which have been included as proposed allocations. Other representations focus on changes to settlement boundaries, particularly in regard to some Smaller Rural Settlements and for settlements which are currently excluded from the settlement boundary policy due to their very rural nature. 75 representations have been received for sites and 12 have been received with general comments from businesses, developers and landowners. Committee is asked to note that the representations will be considered by officers with any proposed major changes presented to

this committee at a future meeting.

Summary of Businesses, Developers and Landowners Representations

Clacton-on-Sea, as the main Strategic Urban Settlement in the district, has received broad support from landowners and developers in regard to the proposed strategic housing/mixed-use allocations. Additional land is also being promoted for a strategic housing/mixed-use development off Sladbury's Lane.

A proposed new strategic housing allocation has been submitted for land at Little Oakley, Smaller Rural Settlement/Ramsey, which relates to the Harwich and Dovercourt, Strategic Urban Settlement and includes a proposed western by-pass.

Weeley has received support from three major landowners and developers in regard to the proposed Expanded Settlement for strategic housing/mixed-use allocations.

Gt Bentley and Elmstead Market are the Rural Service Centres which are the main focus for landowner and developer representations for further housing allocations.

The areas being promoted for new or revised housing/mixed-use are as follows:

Alresford
Ardleigh
Brightlingsea
Clacton
Elmstead Market
Frating
Gt Bentley (including Aingers Green)
Gt Bromley (including Balls Green)
Gt Holland
Gt Oakley (including Stones Green)
Harwich & Dovercourt
Jaywick
Kirby Cross
Kirby-le-Soken
Little Clacton
Little Oakley
Mistley
Ramsey
St Osyth (including Chisbon/St Osyth Heath)
Tendring (including Tendring Green and Tendring Heath)
Thorpe-le-Soken
Thorrington
Walton
Weeley
Weeley Heath

Appendices 2 and 3 contain brief summaries of the Part 1 and Part 2 Local Plan representations, listing the scheme, the main policy issues and an indication of the number of dwellings being promoted (if stated in the submission). Where a submitted site was not included in the Preferred

Options Local Plan, this is noted as (N). Some of the 'new' sites have been submitted previously and considered under earlier stages of the plan process.

The summaries do not refer to associated open space/Green Infrastructure at this stage, although this will be required to support strategic housing and mixed use developments.

Committee is at present asked to note that the representations will be assessed by officers with any proposed major changes formally presented to this committee at a future meeting.

Community Representatives Representations

The range of responses from the community representatives, which include Councillors, Town and Parish Councils and residents' groups amongst others, is one of the most diverse of those received. Of the 37 representations received, a number recommend that the plan be adopted as soon as possible, where others raise significant levels of objection, even stating that the Plan is unsound.

A summary of these representations can be found below. The individual summarised representations can be found in Appendix 4. The representations in full can be viewed on the council's website. Committee is asked to note that the representations will be considered by officers of Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Councils' for Part 1 of the Local Plan and Tendring only for Part 2 of the Local Plan; with any major proposed changes presented to this committee at a future meeting.

Summary of Community Representations Part 1 – North Essex

Councillors: Councillors Julie and Tim Young are concerned to see Tendring building on the Colchester border. The Councillors also wish to see a 1.5km green gap and recommend that any development should catalyse A120 and A133 improvements. They consider health and education should be expanded for both proposed and existing residents and support is given to the expansion of the University of Essex.

Elmstead Parish Council: Expresses concern in regards to the proposed east Colchester / west Tendring garden community: including, impact on the natural environment; public open space; the strategic green gap designation; noise and traffic pollution and worsening public transport services.

Frinton and Walton Town Council: provide suggestions on policy wording improvements (see Appendix 4).

Other Organisations: The Wivenhoe Society raises concerns over the ambitious housing targets set by Colchester Borough Council. They also suggest the west Tendring development is delayed until the end of the plan period by which time experience of developing garden cities would be gained. In addition, the Society suggests that Weeley could accommodate more growth than what is proposed in the Plan. The University of Essex supports the 'garden city' concept and wishes to grow the University on land within Tendring's boundary.

Committee is asked to note that the representations will be considered by officers with any proposed major changes presented to this committee on January 19, 2017.

Summary of Community Representations Part 2 - Tendring

Councillors: Councillors Julie and Tim Young have made a number of comments in regard to the proposed development at Weeley. These concerns include traffic generation, impact on infrastructure and the impact on the character of the village.

A number of requests have been made to amend the Settlement Development Boundary of some settlements and some other mapping changes are suggested by Councillors.

Town and Parish Councils and Residents Groups: Weeley based Councils and residents' groups have varying concerns over the proposed developments at Weeley. The way in which Weeley was identified as an 'expanded settlement' and the amount of growth proposed.

Other Weeley area concerns, included the impact on healthcare, education, highway capacity, loss of agricultural land and the character of the village.

Elsewhere in the district, concern is also expressed in regards to general highway capacity, healthcare and education provision. Suggestion is made that greater weight should be given to rail travel and trackside infrastructure. A number of Parish and Town Councils make the point that infrastructure should be delivered before development commences.

The current car parking capacity and that being exasperated by new developments was mentioned as being a concern within the District's larger towns. The lack of affordable housing throughout the district was also flagged up through representations. The level of development outside of the Tendring district was also seen to potentially have a detrimental impact.

The loss of open countryside and the removal of the Green Gap designation were noted as concerns for some Parish and Town Councils. The impact of flooding and surface water drainage was also raised as potential negative impacts of proposed developments.

Some Councils leant support to both the Weeley and west Tendring developments.

A number of Town and Parish Councils had concerns over the development of specific sites within their area and requested detailed mapping changes. Numerous wording changes to policies and the supporting text are also suggested.

A number of organisations promoted access to the countryside, including bridleways, footpath and public open space.

Committee is asked to note that the representations will be considered by officers with any proposed major changes presented to a future meeting of this Committee.

Members of the Public Representations

Representations have been received from 204 individual members of public. The number of comments within each representation is between 1-80 comments. The majority (1670 out of 2234) of comments are centred on the growth proposed for Weeley. Other representations express concerns regarding development near Elmstead Market for the new Garden Community in West Tendring (375). While the remainder relate to a broad range of places and sites throughout the District (189).

The representations have been broken down into the recurrent themes expressed by members of the public. These topics range from education to economy and from health and wellbeing to transport and congestion.

A summary of these representations can be found below. A fuller summary of the representations can be found in Appendix 5. The representations in full can be viewed on the council's website. Committee is asked to note that the representations will be considered by officers of Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Councils' for Part 1 of the Local Plan and Tendring only for Part 2 of the Local Plan; with any proposed major changes presented to a future meeting of this committee.

Summary of the Members of the Public representations for the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation – 2016 – Part 1 – North Essex

The largest concern within the representations from Members of the Public regarding the new garden community in east Colchester / west Tendring is transport and congestion. This accounts for 8% of comments received across the district.

Members of the public have also shown concern over erosion of the green gap and diminishing healthcare provision accounting for 6% each.

Schools; loss of green space; over development and loss of rural environment account for 5% each.

4% of comments address wildlife/agriculture/habitats. Whilst employment/economy and loss of agricultural land account for 2% each.

Infrastructure; Flooding; Sewerage; Parking; Property Values; New Railway Station; Police & Crime; Crematorium; Affordable Housing; and Social issues in total account for 7% of the correspondence received by the Council.

Representations on the individual policies received 45% of the correspondence.

Summary of the Members of the Public representations for the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation – 2016 – Part 2 (excluding comments on Weeley).

The majority of comments are centred on the growth proposed for Weeley. Other representations express concerns regarding development near Elmstead Market for the new Garden Community in West Tendring. While the remainder relate to a broad range of places and sites throughout the District.

The representations have been broken down into the recurrent themes expressed by members of the public. These topics range from education to economy and from health and wellbeing to transport and congestion.

Although the vast majority of responses from members of the public refer to the proposed development at Weeley, there are a substantial amount of responses which refer to other topics and sites (around 10% of the total correspondence from members of the public). The percentages expressed below are percentages of this 10%.

The most common theme throughout the correspondence is the potential for loss of the rural

environment and village history. This accounts for around 15% of the correspondence.

In regards to health and wellbeing, members of the public are concerned about GP surgeries being overwhelmed by new residents in the area. This accounts for 14% of the correspondence received.

The correspondence also suggests a concern over the increasing levels of traffic congestion in the proposal areas and the added vehicles on the road as a result of the proposed developments. This accounts for 12% of the correspondence received.

12% of correspondence addresses concerns over loss of agriculture, wildlife and conservation more generally. The members of the public are concerned about local habitats being destroyed causing less wildlife.

Members of the public have also expressed concern regarding school overcrowding - suggesting schools are or will be at or over capacity. This was raised in 10% of correspondence.

Members of the public recognise that Tendring being a coastal district, parts of the district are at high risk of flooding through coastal flooding and with the increase in houses, the members of the public are concerned that there will be more surface water flooding due to the increased levels of buildings and roads in the District. This constitutes 9% of the correspondence.

19% of the correspondence addresses concerns over: employment; over development; economy; and air quality or pollution. The general concerns encompassed by this are that there will be over populations of the area leading to a lower quality of life for all of the current residents who submitted objections to the plan.

Summary of the Members of the Public representations for the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation – 2016 – Part 2 (Weeley).

The majority of the correspondence which the Council received in this consultation was from members of the public. Within this section of correspondence, the overwhelming proportion of representations had regard to Weeley (around 90% of all members of the public referred to Weeley).

Within the representations, there are a broad and diverse range of themes. The most recurrent theme was the potential for transport and congestion in and around Weeley. Many members of the public believe that the roads in the area are already at capacity, especially at peak hours. Transport and congestion accounts for around 15% of the total correspondence from members of the public.

The second most recurrent theme was over development and loss of village identity. Members of the public consider that Weeley could not withstand as many houses as proposed by the higher level of Objectively Assessed Needs. This accounts for 13% of Weeley correspondence.

The next most common themes are: sewerage, drainage and flooding; health and wellbeing; and designations on the Weeley local map C30.

In regards to health and wellbeing, members of the public are concerned about GP surgeries being overwhelmed by new residents in the area. Finally, the objections to the Weeley map (C30) are generally in regards to members of the public disagreeing with the suggested allocations. These

three issues combined account for around 30% of the total members of the public's responses regarding Weeley.

Other representations that have been received include matters of: economy; schools; employment; loss of rural environment and village history; air quality and pollution; wildlife; agriculture and conservation. This accounts for around 42% of the total members of the public's responses. All of these themes centre on overcrowding and overpopulation. Further to this, representations express that the effect that the extra people in (and moving through) the area will be a negative action. This will manifest itself in poorer air quality, as well as local habitats being destroyed causing less wildlife. The concerns surrounding the economy, schools and employment are concerns that the current inhabitants will not receive the same level of support and enjoy the same quality of life as they currently have.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Representations

Summary of the Consultation Responses on the Sustainability Appraisal of North Essex Authorities – Common Strategic Part 1

During the Local Plan Preferred Options consultation, the corresponding Sustainability Appraisals of Part 1 and 2 were also published for consultation. The responses received for Part 1 are summarised below:

Technical Stakeholders

None received

Businesses, Landowners and Developers

Gladman Developments Limited: Support is given to Tendring, Colchester and Braintree working together. Questions are raised in regard to the deliverability of housing sites in comparison to the Council's Objectively Assessed Needs requirement. Gladman suggests the District's aging population must be considered through the Sustainability Appraisal. The Council is reminded that, when looking at future developments, consideration should be given as to how they will expand after the plan period. Committee is asked to note that sites are considered beyond the current Local Plan period.

Community Representatives

Councillors Julie and Tim Young are concerned to see Tendring building on the Colchester border. The Councillors also wish to see a 1.5km green gap and recommend that any development should catalyse A120 and A133 improvements. They consider health and education should be expanded for both proposed and existing residents and support is given to the expansion of the University of Essex.

Elmstead Market Parish Council: concerns are made in regard to the loss of 'best and most versatile agricultural land'. It is also stated that residents of Crockleford Heath and Mount Pleasant would be adversely affected by the proposed development contrary to the information within the Sustainability Appraisal.

Members of the Public

A request is made to include the Stour and Orwell estuary within the 'biodiversity' section of the Sustainability Appraisal. Concerns are also raised in regard to the level of development proposed for Harwich and Dovercourt. In particular, impact on traffic and the highway network.

Concerns are raised in regard to the loss of Grade 1 'best and most versatile agricultural land'. In addition, concerns regarding the loss of residential amenity especially at Crockleford Heath and Mount Pleasant are highlighted.

A request is made for the Council to consider Compulsory Purchase of land for development and use of brown field sites. A preference is given to wave and tidal energy over wind energy. A request is also made that developers are taxed to allow for affordable housing.

A suggestion is made to build a new town by the A12.

Committee is asked to note that the representations on the Sustainability Appraisal will be considered by Officers and our Sustainability Appraisal consultants and any proposed major changes will be reported to a future meeting of this committee.

Summary of the Consultation Responses of Sustainability Appraisal of Part 2

Technical Stakeholders

None received

Businesses, Landowners and Developers

Gladman Developments Limited: Welcomes that the North Essex Authorities are working together to prepare a strategic plan. In addition, recognises that Maldon is part of the same Housing Market Area but may be unable to align at this time. (note to Committee – Maldon is not part of Tendring's Housing Market Area – this may be referring to Chelmsford).

The Plan is too rigid and does not give the Council opportunity to react to changes that may arise. LP1 is not specific enough to ensure robust and transparent assessment. The scoring system in LP1 does not seem to be realistic with 600 houses creating a '+' and over 600 houses causing a '-' in housing regeneration.

PPL6 and SP2 are so rigid, they may cause some houses to not be built and therefore the Council may not reach its 5 years housing supply.

Important that settlements (such as Alresford, Little Clacton or Ardleigh) are assessed and meaningful growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability.

Gladman is prepared to deliver 118 dwellings on the site of Wick Lane, Ardleigh within the next 5 years.

Strutt and Parker LLP: Weeley Garden Village (land south of Tendring Park Services) would perform well against the SA objectives. Garden village would ensure the provision of a mix of well-designed housing types, including both market and affordable housing to support existing and growing population.

SA2 and SA3 - Weeley has good transport links and can offer sustainable employment to the

surrounding areas due to its connectivity to the road and rail network. More houses and residents will give a significant and positive impact to the local economy.

SA4 – the mix of housing and workspace ensures there is minimal impact on the local highways and road network as people can live within walking distance of their place of work.

SA5 – Weeley could accommodate 8ha of new employment land; a 1 form new primary school; a new GP surgery/medical centre; a new neighbourhood centre including shops, services and community uses; 7 ha of new public open space.

The site can deliver: a new primary school; GP surgery/medical centre; neighbourhood centre; and public open space; as well as housing.

SA6 – the provision of homes to meet the housing need for the district would be alleviated by Weeley providing the houses. By not overcrowding the higher population density areas, the character of the district will be maintained.

SA7 – the infrastructure and the village are well suited and situated to accommodate the proposed growth.

SA8 – the scale of Weeley Garden Village is suitable for a comprehensive and sustainable drainage system to be integrated. This would reduce the current risk of flooding in the village. Being a Flood Zone 1 would ensure that more flooding prone areas are not being overcrowded. The NPPF states that plans have to be deliverable and the proposed Weeley growth is deliverable.

Community Representatives

None received

Members of the Public

Carol Bannister: Feels she was misled in regards to the purpose of the appraisal. She thought it was aiming to inform on sites that were put forward by developers and landowners. The appraisal should have also have been as objective as possible. Yet Essex County Council remains a key consultee and the document was written by Tendring District Council and analysed by Essex County Council, resulting in the document almost solely being looked at 'in-house'.

Employment site options for Weeley are 'set in stone' and so building in Weeley would destroy the vibrant community. Transport links in Weeley are not good enough. The pedestrian areas (e.g. paths) are sometimes dangerous. Not enough primary school spaces.

She is concerned about the methods used to produce this so-called Sustainability Appraisal. Building in Weeley would annihilate the village community and rural environment.

Ms A V Barnes: Objects to the Plan in its entirety in regard to Weeley. The water table as it currently is would mean any new development would cause flooding to the existing houses of the village. Weeley is not sustainable if it is developed as agriculture and holiday trade are the key areas of its sustainability which development would destroy.

J M Meredith: Too many houses planned and not enough schools, medical practices etc. Sites such as Barnards are being closed yet the Council recommends the Mercedes building to be an

employment site which is next to the Stour and Orwell Special Protection Area. The community is losing schools and open space yet with more and more housing being put in, schools and housing are what the community need. There is a lack of balance.

HA4 offers the football club car park as housing yet without the car park, the football club is not viable.

The Preferred Options Public Consultation Exercise

The consultation period started on Thursday 14 July and ran until Thursday 8 September, during this time officers held 9 public exhibitions across the district. In all, 815 people attended these exhibitions.

As part of the Preferred Options process the Council leafleted every household across the district (and parts of Babergh and Colchester to meet the Duty to Co-operate) to make the residents (and others) aware of the forthcoming consultation events. Some of these leaflets arrived after the first two exhibitions so an additional event was held in Walton-on-the-Naze to cover that part of the district, whilst Clacton already had a second event planned. Officers also wrote to residents of properties adjacent to sites where large scale development was proposed and erected signs with maps to draw attention to the locations for proposed growth.

Date	Venue	No. of attendees
Monday 18 July	Clacton Town Hall, Clacton	15
Wednesday 20 July	Baker Hall, Kirby Cross	16
Wednesday 3 August	Council Chamber, Weeley	125
Thursday 4 August	Columbine Centre, Walton	79
Saturday 13 August	Tendring Enterprise Studio, Clacton	70
Tuesday 16 August	Central Church, Dovercourt	60
Friday 19 August	Council Chamber, Weeley	150
Monday 22 August	Venture Centre, Lawford	100
Tuesday 30 August	Community Centre, Elmstead	200

Within the exhibitions, members of the public were asked to give their comments on the Preferred Options consultation document. Whilst official representations could only be submitted via Objective on the Council's website, on a representation form or by post/email, members of the public were also given the opportunity to submit informal comments at the exhibitions.

The public were invited to write their thoughts on 'post it' notes provided at the exhibitions. These are attached as Appendix 6.

Next Steps

Detailed consideration will be given to the comments made through the recent Preferred Options consultation. Where officers consider that these comments should result in minor changes to the Plan, these will be incorporated into the Plan and reported to the Local Plan Committee on 19 January 2017. If officers identify the need for major changes to policies or allocations, these will be reported to the Local Plan Committee for consideration prior to January 2017. This early consideration will allow production of the Local Plan to proceed according to the agreed timetable.

Consultation responses relating to Part 1 of the Preferred Options will be jointly collated by Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Councils and will be reported back the committees in the respective councils..

APPENDIX 1 - Representations on the Preferred Options Local Plan – Part 1 North Essex and Part 2 Tendring - Technical Stakeholders

Representations on the Preferred Options Local Plan – Part 1 and Part 2 - Technical Stakeholders

Anglian Water (AW)

AW has assessed each of the housing and employment sites and no objections have been made. AW provides an overall Red/Amber/Green rating for all sites and classifies every site as Amber. However, some sites have a Red flag for water recycling capacity, which means these will need to be improved. The additional capacity needed will inform AW's 2020-2025 business plan. AW indicates that the Clacton, Holland, Manningtree and Jaywick water recycling centres would need to be improved and that the phasing of the growth from TDC's allocations should reflect the timing of such improvements. TDC's proposed phasing relies on existing consents in the early years of Local Plan and therefore is compliant with AW's advice.

AW advises that their preferred method for surface water disposal is through Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). TDC's Local Plan is compliant with this advice.

AW requires all new development to connect to the foul water network. AW has assessed where improvements will need to be made to the foul water network and will offer pre-planning to each developer on any requirements for network upgrades.

In relation to the Colchester Fringe, AW advises upgrades will be required and they would welcome early engagement to aid the planning of the garden community.

Braintree District Council (BDC)

BDC welcomes the positive approach to strategic working being undertaken by TDC within the north Essex area. BDC also supports the approach taken on the 550 and 600 homes each year scenarios employed by TDC in the Preferred Options Local Plan consultation.

British Naturalists' Association

Considers that the review of the Coastal Protection Belt has been too severe and identifies areas where it considers the belt should be reinstated.

Chelmsford City Council

Supports Part 1 and Part 2 of the Local Plan and requests that the northeast Chelmsford bypass is added to Part 1 of the Local Plan.

Colchester Borough Council (CBC)

CBC formally objected to the previous Submission version of Local Plan for Tendring District

Council based on the scale and distribution of the proposed growth. CBC does however support both Part 1 and Part 2 of the current Preferred Options Local Plan. CBC has suggested some areas for change.

- i. That the area of search for the Colchester Fringe should not be shown on an ordnance survey based map and that the indicative A120/A133 link road should not be shown.
- ii. That references to the Colchester Fringe should not be made in Part 2 of the Local Plan.
- iii. That the Submission version of the Local Plan does not include a range of housing targets i.e. 550-600 but sets a definitive target.
- iv. CBC supports the phasing and delivery schedule of the housing supply.
- v. CBC suggests further joint evidence may be required on affordable housing targets as they differ for CBC and TDC's Local Plans.
- vi. CBC supports the potential link road from the A120 to the A133 but considers Policy CP2 should make more reference to public transport including rapid transit and park and ride.
- vii. CBC welcomes our approach to rail and suggests we seek to enhance access to stations as part of development proposals.
- viii. CBC suggests any development proposals for the Ardleigh Crown area should not conflict with CBC's Green Orbital route. The Local Plan does not contain any proposals for the Ardleigh Crown area.

Colchester Natural History Society

Would prefer no development east of Colchester in the vicinity of Salary Brook but if development does take place – the Society gives a preference for it to be 1.5 km away from the brook. The Society provides a list of invertebrates, birds, plants and moths in the area.

Environment Agency (EA)

EA are very supportive of the Garden Communities policies and provide comments for some minor improvements. They suggest more emphasis should be placed on blue infrastructure, that flood risk issues are added to PP10 (Camping and Touring Caravans), strengthening policy on flood issues within PP11 (Holiday Parks), and suggested improvements to PPL1 (Development and Flood Risks), PPL 4 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity) and PPL 5 (Water Conservation, Drainage and Sewerage).

EA wish to see the sequential (and potentially exceptions) test carried out for the Local Plan allocations with reference to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

EA points out that Policy PP14 (Priority Areas for Regeneration) will specifically require the sequential and exceptions test. They also point out that regeneration will reduce the deprivation index – meaning less priority for EA funding. Similarly, they point out any new development post

2012 cannot be included in calculations for flood defence grant aid from EA. More positively, EA offer to work with TDC to produce a guide for small plot or plot level rebuilds to support Flood Risk Assessments for planning applications.

Essex County Council (ECC)

ECC formally objected to the previous Submission version of Local Plan for Tendring District Council based on the scale and distribution of the proposed growth. ECC however, does support both Part 1 and Part 2 of the current Preferred Options Local Plan. ECC has suggested some areas for change and requirements for infrastructure to support the proposed growth.

Part 1

- i. Minor alterations to wording in Part 1 policies.
- ii. Seeks a link road between the A120 and A133 for the east of Colchester garden community.
- iii. Seeks two – two form primary schools and one - four form secondary school, plus early years provision for the east of Colchester garden community.
- iv. Supports our references to SuDS and encourages multi use green space for recreation and wildlife.
- v. Supports community facilities and long terms stewardship policies.

Part 2

- i. Recommends the introduction at Part 2 moves to before Part 1.
- ii. Provides additional text regarding the Essex Minerals Local Plan and the Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan.
- iii. Recommends minor changes to the Vision and Objectives such as changing ‘health care’ to ‘health’ in order to capture the wider health agenda.
- iv. Add ‘Climate Change’ to HP3 (Green Infrastructure).
- v. Recommends some site-specific policies for the larger allocations.
- vi. Requires the following in regards to education for the proposed allocations:
 - a. Clacton-on-Sea: Two – two-form entry primary schools. Re-opening Bishops Park College or expanding secondary schools in the Clacton/Frinton area. One 30-place nursery co-located with a new primary school.
 - b. Harwich and Dovercourt: Expansion of one or more primary schools. Use of existing surplus in secondary accommodation.
 - c. Frinton, Walton and Kirby: Expansion of one or more primary schools. Re-opening Bishops Park College or expanding secondary schools in the Clacton/Frinton area

(including consented growth). One 30-place nursery co-located with a new primary school.

- d. Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley: Expansion of one or more primary schools and 1-2 additional forms of entry for Manningtree High School (including consented growth). One 30-place nursery co-located with a new primary school.
- e. Brightlingsea some expansion of primary and secondary places may be required. One 30-place nursery co-located with existing primary school.
- f. Weeley: For Scenario 1 (304 homes) expansion of St Andrew's Church of England Primary School, use of existing catchment capacity at Tendring Technology College – Thorpe (note this may reduce places for non-catchment areas). For Scenario 2 (1,411 homes) 1 – two form entry primary school. The secondary school provision is more complex for years 7-9; this could be accommodated through Tendring Technology Campus (Thorpe). Years 10 and 11 would need to be accommodated by the Frinton campus or years 7-11 could be accommodated by the reopening of Bishops Park Technology College or the expansion of secondary schools in Frinton/Clacton. One 30-place nursery co-located with a new primary school.
- g. Rural Service Centres: Expansion of existing primary schools – though it is pointed out Elmstead and Thorpe-Le-Soken have limited scope for expansion.

- vii. Minor policy change suggestions to Living Places Policies 2,3,4,5,6,8,9,10
- viii. Support to Living Places Policy 11 (HMO)
- ix. Minor policy change suggestions to Prosperous Places Policies 6,7,8,11,12 and 14. Specific request to discuss Oakwood and Crusader Business Parks in relation to the emerging Minerals Local Plan.
- x. Minor policy change suggestions to Protected Places Policies 1,2,4,5,7 and 11. Suggest TDC updates its 'Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2009)'.
- xi. Minor policy change suggestions to Connected Places Policies 1 and 2.
- xii. Suggests a new policy covering developer contributions and provides an example.
- xiii. Provides additions to the Glossary of Terms.
- xiv. Heritage Assets – suggests text is updated to reflect the 2015 'Protected Lanes' review (nine lanes for protection).
- xv. Add 'London' to references to Stansted Airport.

Highways England (HE)

HE supports the approach made to transport in the Local Plan. HE wishes to support the Local

Plan to deliver its growth and highlights key strategic projects as:

- A120 Braintree to Marks Tey, long term (dualling) – led by ECC to determine options for a new A120 route between Braintree and the A12.
- A12 widening between J19 and J25.
- Highway modelling of the effect of three Local Plans; Braintree, Colchester and Tendring, including a 'Rapid Transit Study' for East Colchester/West Tendring.
- The A12/A120 route based strategy as published by the Highways Agency in March 2013 and revised strategies that are being prepared for delivery post 2020.
- Supporting the case for improved rail connections to Essex and beyond.

HE considers that increased emphasis should be put on the public transport, walking and cycling, including access to rail stations.

Specifically, for Tendring HE advises:

Growth proposed at Clacton-on-Sea, Frinton and Walton, Harwich, Manningtree, Thorpe-Le-Soken and Weeley is unlikely to have severe impact on the A120. Growth at Gt Bentley may have adverse impact on the A120 and that this should be assessed. For the Colchester Fringe, HE advises a business case be developed for the link road and a new junction on the A120. HE advises that an upgraded junction would have less impact on the A120 than a roundabout.

Historic England

Historic England will provide any representations in time to be taken account of, for the January meeting of this Committee.

Royal Mail (RM)

RM advises that for every 500 new homes a new postal round needs to be created. For RM this means that they need to consider the expansion of assets to accommodate the growth. RM has sites in Clacton-on-Sea, Wivenhoe, Brightlingsea, Frinton-on-Sea, Harwich and Manningtree. RM is satisfied that Policy PP6 (employment Sites) will protect assets within designated areas but is concerned regarding sites not protected under the current Local Plan employment policies. Here RM considers any proposals for growth from housing or retail should attenuate the noise from RM assets and not seek removal of the RM assets.

RM supports Policy CM2 (Improving the Transport Network)

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)

The RSPB suggests that a number of policies should remove 'or' and 'and/or' to make them consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. They also recommend improvements to the vision and objectives in relation biodiversity and request that Walton Mere is added to Table

D1. The RSPB wishes to review the Habitats Regulation Assessment. This Assessment is made on the submission version of the Local Plan and Land Use Consultants have been appointed to produce the HRA.

The Theatres Trust

Suggests changes to Policy HP2 including the removal of the word 'viability'.

Natural England (NE)

NE suggests an objective should be added to part 1 of the Local Plan to cover landscape and climate change. A number of comments have been made on policies throughout the Local Plan in relation to paragraph ordering, additions and wording changes. NE would like to assist TDC with the Habitats Regulation Assessment.

Network Rail (NR)

NR welcomes support in removing any potentially dangerous level crossings and makes specific reference to level crossings which may be affected by the Local Plan proposed allocations:

Oakwood – the Giles User Worked Crossing (UWC) and Giles Footpath Crossing. NR considers that the change of use would mean the Giles UWC could be removed, as it would no longer be required. NR flag the need for early engagement on mitigation for the Giles Footpath Crossing, given the likely increase in usage.

Colchester Fringe – operational rail infrastructure is within the broad area of search and as such, impacts must be assessed in mixed use allocated in the vicinity.

Great Bentley – NR comment on the need to engage with them on impacts to footpaths on Gt Bentley Footpath and Lords Level Crossing.

Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley – NR requests to be engaged in any discussion regarding road improvement in the vicinity of the CCTV Level Crossing east of Manningtree Station.

Weeley – NR wishes to be engaged in discussion on the future of the Church Lane Footpath Crossing and potential station improvements that may be required of the proposed Weeley allocations.

National Health Service – North East Essex Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)

The CCG notes that there are 15 GP Practices, 4 branch surgeries, 34 pharmacies, 15 dental surgeries, 17 opticians and 2 community hospitals in Tendring District Council's administrative area. The CCG considers that the growth in employment and housing will require a growth in GP practices. The CCG alongside NHS England has commenced work on assessing the optimal space requirements for a full range of services to be delivered within the community. The CCG suggests that the Local Plan makes it clear that developments will be subject to financial contributions to the CCG/NHS but to not be specific in regards to what actually needs to be delivered or specific timeframes as this should be discussed at Planning Applications stage in light

of the CCG's 'Five Year Forward View', 'Strategic Estates and Primary Care Strategy' and 'Sustainability Transformation Plans'. However, to provide information to support the Local Plans Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the CCG has provided the expected requirements and their anticipated costs for potential developments in the Tendring District. This includes new Health Centre(s) for the Colchester Fringe, Weeley, Elmstead and Gt Bentley areas and a new Health Centre for the west Clacton area, with enhanced facilities at Oakwood Park, Harwich, Brightlingsea, Alresford, Little Clacton, Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley and Thorpe-Le-Soken. In addition, the recent consents in the Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross areas have provided almost a million pounds towards a new Health Centre in this area.

The CCG has also provided suggestions for improvements to the Part 1 Local Plan policies in relation to health and the Healthy Places chapter in Part 2 of the Local Plan.

APPENDIX 2 – Businesses, Landowners and Developers – Part 1 Local Plan

BUSINESSES, LANDOWNERS AND DEVELOPERS – Part 1 Local Plan

Richard & Ronald Allwright and Peter Bray (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Policy SP1 – support

Policy SP2 – object – will not deliver enough housing to meet OAHN (Objectively Assessed Housing Need)

The Burghes Estate (Agent Berrys)

Policy SP2 – support – Plan should identify land for >11,000 dwellings to ensure delivery

Chelmsford Diocese Board of Finance (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Policy SP2 – object - plan unsound – not effective or consistent with national policy re. meeting OAHN

Sites not identified for delivery in short-term.

David Foster (Agent Boyer)

Policy SP3 – vary – sites previously allocated but not delivered should be carefully considered

Policy SP5 – vary – give support to innovative and unique schemes

Gladman Developments Ltd.

Vision - support

Policy SP3 – object to criterion (b) – contrary to NPPF

Policy SP4 – object – recognise need but requirements for necessary new infrastructure and facilities not assessed?

Policy SP6 - support 3 new garden communities approach

Policy SP7 - object - fundamentally flawed and in conflict with NPPF

Policy SP9 – support but delivery trajectory must be realistic – smaller and medium sized sites needed early in plan period.

Hills Building Group (Agent Phase 2 Planning & Development Ltd)

Policy SP8 – vary - no objection in principle but concerns over assumptions regarding deliverability.

Knight Developments Ltd (Agent Phase 2 Planning & Development Ltd)

Policy SP8 – vary - no objection in principle but concerns over assumptions regarding deliverability.

Mr Tim Martin (Agent MatPlan Ltd)

Policy SP2 – object/vary - revise table in Part 2 LP1 to be consistent

Policy SP7 – object/vary - object as drafted until comprehensive information and delivery arrangements available
Policy SP8 – object/vary - object as drafted until comprehensive information and delivery arrangements available
Delivery Arrangements – object/vary - comments as in SP7 & SP8.

Persimmon Homes

Policy SP2 – need to be mindful of wider HMA which includes Greater London Authority (constraints exist within London itself and Metropolitan Green Belt areas/Authorities)
Policy SP4 – timing of delivery of new infrastructure unclear
Policy SP6 – object – evidence base not robust re. delivery
Policy SP7 - object – uncertainty re. amount, location and delivery – implications for OAN
Policy SP8 – Boundaries should be defined in LP –realistic delivery trajectory should be included.

Rosegrade (Agent Holmes & Hills LLP)

Vision – object
Policy SP2 – object
Policy SP6 – object

Sammi Developments Ltd (Agent Phase 2 Planning & Development Ltd)

Policy SP8 – vary - no objection in principle but concerns over assumptions regarding deliverability.

St Monica's Trust (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Policy SP2 – object – plan unsound - not effective or consistent with national policy re. meeting OAN
Policy SP6 – Additional development should be distributed throughout settlement hierarchy – concerns over Weeley Expanded Settlement and Windfall approach.

Taylor Wimpey (Agent Woolf Bond Planning)

Policy SP2 – object – plan should identify enough deliverable sites to help deliver 12,000 dwellings.
Policy SP3 – object – support employment allocation at Weeley but should be part of mixed-use scheme to include: housing; community facilities; local centre; land for primary school; and public open space.

Tendring Farms Ltd (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Policy SP6 – sound relation to Part 2 Policy SPL1 re. Mistley, Manningtree & Lawford.

University of Essex

Policy SP4 – support
Policy S7 – support - The University broadly supports the 'garden city' concept; this needs early completion of key road between A120 and the A133.

Mr George Wright (Agent Hills Building Group)

Policy SP8 – vary - no objection in principle but concerns over assumptions regarding deliverability.

APPENDIX 3 - Businesses, Landowners and Developers – Part 2 Local Plan

BUSINESSES, LANDOWNERS AND DEVELOPERS – Part 2 Local Plan

Sites being promoted for new housing or mixed-use including housing

Alresford

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Seeking increased housing provision in Rural Service Centres.

Include land north of Cockaynes Lane for housing (N).

Ardleigh

Promoter – Mr D Brasted (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Submission – Include land at Old Ipswich Road within Colchester Fringe – Local Map 12 (N).

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include land east of Turnpike Close for housing (N), or employment

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include land north of Old Ipswich Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Gladman Developments Ltd.

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1, SPL3, HP1, LP1, LP2, LP4, LP5, LP10, PP12, PPL3, PPL6, PPL8 and PPL10

‘Site-specific’ – SPL2 - Local Map 9

Include land north of Wick Lane/Colchester Road for housing - up to 118No. dwellings (N).

Promoter – Harris Plumpton Trust (Agent Evolution Planning)

Submission – object to Policies SPL1 and SPL2

‘Site-specific’ – 4No. sites proposed for housing:

Land between Wick Lane, Colchester Road and Dead Lane – up to 30 units (N).

Land south of Colchester Road – up to 20 units (N).

Land south of Aveline Road (N).

Land south of Harwich Road (N).

Promoter – Mr Brian Stapleton

Submission – Land adjacent to the cemetery with access to Harwich Road in the Southeast corner, could accommodate up to 15 more houses.

Promoter – Mr R Steward (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land north east of Ardleigh Road for housing – 5No. units (N).

Brightlingsea

Promoter – J S Blyth & Sons Ltd (Agent Honace)

Submission – Propose mixed-use allocation land north of Robinson Road

Promoter – Hills Building Group

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Local Map 9

Include land north of Samson's Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Hopkins Homes Ltd

Submission – Brightlingsea should be elevated above Rural Heartland.

'Dwelling stock' should be changed to 'new homes'. The words 'short fall' at the start indicate a failure from the outset. LP1 fails to deliver a minimum requirement. The policy should delete 100homes for Brightlingsea and replace it with 120.

Promoter – Tim Snow Architects

Submission – We would like to see a variation of the settlement boundary at the end of Batemans Road (formerly Ideal Nurseries Site). The site could be accessed from Talbot Road and Thorington Road as well as Batemans Lane.

Clacton

Promoter – Mr K Acres

Submission – Crossways Garden Centre, Thorpe Road Little Clacton for development.

Promoter – Richard & Ronald Allwright and Peter Bray (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1, SPL2, LP1, LP7 and PPL6

'Site-specific' - Local Map 10 Part A in respect of proposed mixed-use and housing allocations and Local Wildlife Site ref. Te92.

Include land south of Centenary Way, Clacton for housing (N).

Promoter – Bloor Homes (Agent Barton Willmore)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1, LP1, LP5 and PPL6

Submission – Include land north of Rush Green Road/east of Jaywick Lane for housing. General support for growth but object to housing supply, including affordable housing and Green Gap policies.

Promoter – Brown & Meek (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2, HP4 and PPL6 - object

Include land south of Rush Green Road for housing – 60No. units (N).

Promoter – ECC (Agent Bidwells)

Submission – The following policies are supported:

LP2 Housing Choice

LP10 Care and Assisted Living

Specific representation made in regard to Coppins Court – "... the Local Plan must specifically allocate the site for C2 use, rather than simply for a general residential allocation"

Promoter – Robert Giles

Submission – support mixed-use allocation east of Thorpe Road to include approx. 288No. dwellings

Promoter – Land Logic Ltd. (Agent MatPlan Ltd.)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies LP1 and PPL6

‘Site-specific’ - Policies SPL2 and Local Maps 10, 11 and 24 in respect of proposed mixed-use and housing allocations.

Land south of London Road, Clacton is being promoted for approximately 230No. dwellings (N).

Promoter – Messrs Lord & Hunt (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land west of Earls Hall Drive for housing – 30No.dwellings (N).

Promoter – Merchant Projects Ltd. (Agent Artisan)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policy SPL1

‘Site-specific’ - Land at Foot’s Farm, south of Centenary Way, Clacton is being promoted for approximately 120No. dwellings (Local Map 11) (N).

Promoter – Mr R O’Dell (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - support

Include land west of Earls Hall Drive/north of St John’s Road for housing – 70No.dwellings net (N).

Promoter – Persimmon Homes

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1, SPL3, HP1-4, LP1, LP2, LP3, LP4, LP5, PP3, CP1 CP2 and PPL11

‘Site-specific’ - Policy SPL2 and Local Map 10

Include land west of Jaywick Lane/south of St John’s Road for mixed-use including approx. 1,145 dwellings, primary school, GP surgery/medical centre and neighbourhood centre.

Promoter – Sammi Developments Ltd (Agent Phase 2)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

‘Site-specific’ - Policies SPL2 and Local Map 11

Include land west of Sladbury’s Lane/south of Burr’s Road for mixed-use (N).

Promoter – Scott Properties (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – Support allocation of land east of Thorpe Road/south of Holland Road (‘Oakwood Park’) for mixed-use including 1000No. dwellings, education, health, care and retail.

Promoter – Silverton Aggregates (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy PP6 - object

Include land north-west of Oxford Road for housing (not employment)

Promoter – Tim Snow Architects

Submission – We support the allocation of housing to the north of Centenary Way.

Promoter – St Monica’s Trust (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies LP1 and PPL6

'Site-specific' - Local Map 10

Land west of Cherry Tree Avenue, Clacton is being promoted for housing (N).

Promoter – TDC – Mr Ian Taylor

Submission – Extend settlement boundary to include The Esplanade Holland on Sea up to the Gunfleet Boating Club

Promoter – Mr & Mrs Wild (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - support

Include land west of Little Clacton Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Mr T Wild, Greenwich Hospital Trust & Mr P Smith (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2, LP1, LP2 and CP2 - support

Include land west of London Road (Hartley Gardens) for housing up to 2,500 units.

Elmstead Market

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Increase housing provision in Rural Service Centres

Include land west of School Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Hills Building Group

Submission – representations comprise:

Concerns re. SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Include land north of Clacton Road for housing - Local Map 13 (N).

Promoter – Hills Building Group

Submission – representations comprise:

Concerns re. SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Include land of south Clacton Road for housing (2No. sites) - Local Map 13 (N).

Promoter – Hills Building Group

Submission – representations comprise:

Concerns re. SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Include land east of School Road for housing - Local Map 13 (N).

Promoter – Hills Building Group

Submission – representations comprise:

Concerns re. SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' - Include land east of Tye Road for housing - Local Map 13 (N).

Promoter – Knight Developments Ltd (Agent Phase 2)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1, LP1 and Local Map 13

'Site-specific' - Include land west of Church Road for housing - Local Map 13 (N).

Promoter – Wivenhoe Park Estates (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – Include land to western boundary of village for housing - Local Map 13 (N).

Frating

Promoter – Colchester Gospel Hall Trust

Submission – We welcome: the provision of places of worship, whether they are newly built or conversions; provision for burial sites; extension of Frating settlement boundary to include the gospel hall in Colchester Road.

Gt Bentley (including Aingers Green)

Promoter – City & Country (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

‘Site-specific’ - Include land west of Plough Road for housing (N).

Promoter – City & Country (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

‘Site-specific’ - Include land north of Thorrington Road for housing – up to 90No. dwellings (N).

Promoter – City & Country (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

‘Site-specific’ - Include land south of Thorrington Road for housing – up to 60No. dwellings (N).

Promoter – Gibbon Farms (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Submission – Include Aingers Green as a ‘Smaller Rural Settlement’

Include land west of Plough Road for housing (2No. sites) (N).

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include Aingers Green as a ‘Smaller Rural Settlement’ – Policy SPL1

Include land west of St Mary’s Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Mr & Mrs Strutt (Agent Pomery Planning Consultants)

Submission – Include land north of The Green for housing (N).

Promoter – Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP (Agent Star Planning & Development)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL2 and LP1

‘Site-specific’ - Local Map 16

Include land west of Heckford’s Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Mr George Wright (Agent Hills Building Group)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

‘Site-specific’ - Local Map 16

Include land east of Heckford’s Road for housing (N).

Gt Bromley – (including Balls Green)

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include land east of Frating Road for housing (N).

Gt Holland

Promoter – Ms H Hill (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land south of Hamilton Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Ms H Hill (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 and PPL6 - object

Include land north of Little Clacton Road for housing (N).

Gt Oakley (including Stones Green)

Promoter – Chelmsford Diocese Board of Finance (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL2 and LP1

‘Site-specific’ – Include land south-west of Beaumont Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Chelmsford Diocese Board of Finance (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL2 and LP1

‘Site-specific’ – Include land south-west of Wix Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Cooper Bros. (Gt Oakley Ltd) (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land north of Stones Green Road for housing – 6No. units (N).

Harwich & Dovercourt

Promoter – Cadena AM Ltd

Submission – supports the Local Plan. Land at Greenfields Farm, Dovercourt would create 164 dwellings for the housing allocation. 819 dwellings within the plan period for the Harwich & Dovercourt area would also be achievable.

Promoter – Elm Farm Country Park Limited and Elm Farm Caravan Park Limited

Submission – Fully support proposed growth at Elm Farm.

Promoter – Paul Hales

Submission – Support Policy LP3 and the proposed site at Low Road, Dovercourt.

Promoter – Harding Estates (East Anglia) Ltd (Agent Peter Brett Assoc.)

Submission – Comments on Policies PP1, PP2, PP4 and PP7 – ref. PP 14/01431/OUT - Include land at Pond Hall Farm for mixed use – employment, retail, leisure and residential (Local Map 20). Specific policy requested.

Jaywick

Promoter – B D & I R Rendell

Submission – object to land opposite No. 27 – 45 Garden Road not being included for development

Kirby Cross

Promoter – The Burghes Estate (Agent Berrys)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies PPL6 and LP1

‘Site-specific’ - Local Map 15

The site at Turpins Farm can accommodate 210No. dwellings. In addition to the 240No. dwellings at Hallstead Road this results in an ‘over-supply’ of 74No. dwellings. The contribution to growth from F, W & KC should be increased by at least a further 350No. dwellings.

Promoter – The Land and Planning Company

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

‘Site-specific’ - Local Map 15

Include land south of Thorpe Road for housing (up to 50No. units) (N).

Promoter – Mr R Sawyer (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land north of Thorpe Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP (Agent Star Planning & Development)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL2, PPL6 and LP1

‘Site-specific’ - Local Map 15

Include land east of Halstead Road for housing (N).

NB re. App. Ref: 15/01234/OUT – Up to 240 dwellings with a community hub including either a 40-bed space care home (Class C2) or a healthcare facility (Class D1) – refused – Appeal allowed

Kirby-le-Soken

Promoter – Pomery Planning Consultants

Submission – Support the alteration to the settlement boundary to include the end of Chartfield Drive. The inclusion of this modest site will allow some sustainable and appropriate growth in this settlement (Local Map 21).

Lawford

Promoter – Affinity Water (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policies SPL2 and PPL6 - object

Include land east of Colchester Road (north of Long Road/west of Trinity Road) for housing (N).

Promoter – The Pattle Will Trust (Agent Hawkspur)

Policies SPL1, SPL2 and LP1 - object

Include land north of Grange Road for housing – up to 30No.units

Little Clacton

Promoter – Mr N Barrington-Fuller (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land north-east of Connaught Road for housing – 8No.dwellings (N).

Promoter – Mr N Barrington-Fuller & Mr Lee (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land north of Batemans Road/south-west of Weeley Road for housing – up to 50No.dwellings (N).

Promoter – Britton Developments (Agent – Martin Robeson Planning Practice)

Submission – Include land north of Centenary Way for housing (Local Map 24) (N).

Promoter – Chase New Homes

Submission – Local Map 24 - amend proposed Settlement Boundary to south-west of Weeley Road to extend ribbon development to allow new housing (N).

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include land east of The Street for housing (11No. units) (N).

Promoter – Gladman Developments Ltd.

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1, SPL3, HP1, LP1, LP2, LP4, LP5, LP10, PP12, PPL3, PPL6, PPL8 and PPL10

'Site-specific' - SPL2 - Local Map 9

Include land east of Amerells Road for housing - up to 115No. dwellings (N).

Little Oakley

Promoter – Foulton Hall Farms (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Submission – Include land southeast of Harwich Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Landfast Ltd (Agent Edward Gittins & Assoc.)

Submission – Include land at Little Oakley for housing, to include a link road/Dovercourt Western Bypass – approx. 400No. units total (N).

NB Part of land includes site of App. Ref: 15/00964/OUT – 71 dwellings – refused – Appeal dismissed

Also see Ramsey below as site area includes land in Ramsey Parish

Mistley

Promoter – Anglia Malting (Holdings) Ltd (Agent VRG Planning)

Submission – Include Edme site as regeneration area, allocate for mixed-use including housing, remove employment safeguarding and prioritise brownfield (N).

Promoter – Mr R Brooks (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 and PPL6 - object

Include land west of Trinity Road for housing (N).

Promoter – David Foster (Agent Boyer)

Submission – Include land to east of Mistley Port for housing (N).

Promoter – Tendring Farms Ltd (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – Supports the Plan re. growth - Mistley, Manningtree & Lawford sustainable settlement/s

Concern over other aspects of Plan soundness – Policy LP1, LP3 and SPL1

Include land south of Long Road, west of Clacton Road for housing (N).
NB App. Ref: 15/00761/OUT - Up to 300 dwellings and up to 2 hectares of employment land (A2/A3/B1/D1 uses) – Approved

Promoter – Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP (Agent Star Planning & Development)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL2 and LP1

‘Site-specific’ - Local Map 27B

Include land east of Harwich Road for housing – fully support proposed allocation (ref. also PP Ref. 15/01520/OUT – up to 135No. dwellings). However, object to extent of allocation. Request amend settlement boundary to accommodate minimum 180No. dwellings (N).

Ramsey

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include land and south of Church Hill, Ramsey for housing – approx. 71No. dwellings (N).

NB App. Ref: 15/00964/OUT – 71 dwellings – refused – Appeal dismissed

Promoter – Landfast Ltd (Agent Edward Gittins & Assoc.)

Submission – Include land south of Church Hill, Ramsey for housing, to include a link road/Dovercourt Western Bypass – approx. 400No. dwellings total (N).

NB Part of land includes site of App. Ref: 15/00964/OUT – 71 dwellings – refused – Appeal dismissed

Also see Little Oakley above as site area includes land in Little Oakley Parish

Promoter – Nigel Neal and associate land owners

Submission – Amend proposed Settlement Boundary as in 2012 Draft Plan

St Osyth (including Chisbon/St Osyth Heath)

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include Chisbon Heath as a ‘Smaller Rural Settlement’ – Policy SPL1

Include land north of Heath Road for housing (N).

Tendring (including Tendring Green and Tendring Heath)

Promoter – Mr T Blake (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Submission – Include land northeast of Heath Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Chelmsford Diocese Board of Finance (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL2 and LP1

‘Site-specific’ – Include land west of Heath Road (The Old Chapel) for housing (N).

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include land south-west of Heath Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Ms S Harrison Osborne (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Submission – Include land north-west of Heath Road for housing – max. 5No. units (N).

Thorpe-le-Soken

Promoter – The Lifehouse (Agent Ideas in Place)

Submission – Include land south of Frinton Road/east of Station Road for housing, business and leisure uses – 200No. dwellings, 42No. Independent Living units, 50No. Attended care units, 50No. Luxury holiday units, and 600sqm business space (N).

Promoter – Rosegrade Ltd (Agent Homes & Hills)

Submission – Include land west of Station Road for housing (approx. 25No. units) (N).

Promoter – Scott Properties (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – Support proposed allocation (100No. dwellings)

Promoter – Tim Snow Architects

Submission – 30 ha of land to the north of Thorpe Park Lane, and west of Frinton Road. The site is called Rose Farm Quarry. The site would be perfect for the Life House Spa Hotel.

Promoter – Mr M Stobbs (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Submission – Include land west of Golden Lane for housing – max. 3No. units (N).

Thorrington

Promoter – Mr J P Phelan (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Submission – Include land northeast of Heath Road for housing (max. 6No. units) – Local Map 32 (N).

Promoter – St John's College, Cambridge (Agent Savills Planning)

Submission – representations comprise:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

'Site specific' - Include land west of Church Road for housing (approx. 50No. dwellings)

'Site specific' - Include land east of Station Road/north of Clacton Road for housing (approx. 60No. dwellings)

Walton

Promoter – owners (Agent Collins & Coward)

Submission – include 2 sites adjoining Walton Mere for housing (approx.20 No. dwellings each) (N).

Weeley

Promoter – Andrew Bacon (Agent Strutt & Parker)

Submission – Representations received in regard to:

Policies SPL1 and LP1

'Site-specific' – Weeley Garden Village (Local Map 33).

Concept of Expanded/Garden Village supported including site-specific land south of Colchester Road between Weeley and Little Clacton by-passes. Approx.1000No.dwellings, primary school, neighbourhood centre, and GP surgery/medical centre.

Promoter – Rose Builders (Agent Mr Brian Morgan)
Submission – Representations received in regard to:
Policy LP1 and PP3

‘Site-specific’ – Expanded Settlement (Local Map 33).

Concept of Expanded/Garden Village supported including site-specific land south of Thorpe Road. 550No. dwellings and associated community infrastructure – option for possible primary school, Parish Council Office, retail, ‘start up’ offices and GP medical centre. Support space south of Thorpe Road; perfectly placed for development. A chance for Weeley to become a nucleated settlement. The centre should be in the traditional centre of the village with access for pedestrians and cyclists.

Promoter – Mr G Swinscoe (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land north of Thorpe Road for housing – 30No.dwellings (N).

Promoter – Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (Agent Woolf Bond Planning)

Submission – Representations received in regard to:

Policies SP2 and supporting text, SP3 and supporting text and LP1.

‘Site-specific’ – Expanded Settlement (Local Map 33).

Include land (20ha) north of Colchester Road for mixed use – 380No. dwellings, site for employment (approx. 3ha) - B1/B2 business space, 1,500sqm local centre and medical centre (approx. 0.5ha), land for a primary school and play/recreation facilities. Proposed Plan allocation for employment land is supported but this should be part of a mixed-use scheme.

Weeley Heath

Promoter – Britton Developments (Agent Martin Robeson Planning Practice)

Submission – Include land north-east of Clacton Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Mr Tom Doran (Agent - GVA Grimley)

Submission – Local Map 30 - amend proposed Settlement Boundary to south of railway line and allocate for the following mixed uses:

- housing
- holiday caravan park expansion
- residential caravan park
- possible community/leisure facility - if enough park homes and holiday caravans (N).

Promoter – Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Submission – Include land south-east of Mill Lane for housing (N).

Promoter – Mr J Green, Mrs V Wright & Mr N Barrington-Fuller (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 – object

Policy LP7 - support

Include land south west of Clacton Road for housing (N).

Promoter – Kays Properties (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land west of Clacton Road for housing – 120No.dwellings (N).

Promoter – St Osyth Beach Estate Ltd (Agent Boyer Planning)

Policies SPL1, LP1 and Local Maps 33 and 34 - object

Objectives and Policies PP8 and PP10 – support

Submission – Include 3No. sites for housing at::

Land east of Rectory Road

Land west of Bentley Road

Land east of Rectory Road/south of Mill Lane

Representations which concern existing and proposed employment-related sites including tourism:

- One representation has been received in regard to retail and leisure facilities at Clacton Factory Outlet Centre:

Kames Capital (acting for AEGON UK Property Fund Ltd) (Agent RPS CgMs)

Representation – Object to Policy PP2, amend Policy PP6

District retail need should be met partly through re-designation of Clacton Factory Shopping Village as an identified 'District Centre'. Required for a 'sound' Local Plan.

- One representation has been received in regard to employment land allocation at EDME Maltings, Mistley.

Promoter – Anglia Malting (Holdings) Ltd (Agent VRG Planning)

Submission – Include Edme site as a regeneration area, allocate for mixed-use (residential-led) and remove employment safeguarding.

- One representation has been received in regard to employment land allocation at Bramble Island, Gt Oakley

Promoter – EPC-United Kingdom PLC (Agent Leith Planning Ltd)

Object – no reference to Bramble Island site, nature of operation (hazardous substance) or biodiversity value of land.

- Two representations have been received in regard to employment land allocation at Mistley Port.

Promoter – David Foster (Agent Boyer)

Submission – Object to allocation of land to east of Mistley Port as employment site – contrary to NPPF para.22 and not under control of Mistley Port. No evidence that expansion of Mistley Port is viable.

Policies SPL3, LP2, PP7 and PP8

Promoter – TW Logistics Ltd.

Submission – Object to protection of Mistley Port as a general employment site. Site-specific marine/port designation is required. Also, for allocation of land for port expansion.

Further comments re. Edme Maltings and Crisp Maltings - not identified as employment sites.

Policies PP6, PP7 and Local Map 27.

- One representation has been received in regard to employment land allocation at Carless Refinery, Parkeston.

Promoter – Haltermann Carless (Agent Keningtons)

Submission – Include land west of the refinery for employment expansion and remove land proposed for expansion to north (as owned by Network Rail).

- One representation has been received which includes employment and mixed uses at the Lifehouse, Thorpe-le-Soken.

Promoter – The Lifehouse (Agent Ideas in Place)

Submission – Include land south of Frinton Road/east of Station Road for business and leisure uses (and housing) – 600sqm business space, 50No. Attended care units, 50No. Luxury holiday units and 42No. Independent living units (and 200No. dwellings).

- One representation has been received in regard to tourism, retail and community/leisure facilities at Low Road, Dovercourt

Promoter – Onslow Holdings Ltd (Agent Marlborough & Co)

Submission – Include land south of Low Road for “chalet style” mobile home park, family tavern, fast food restaurant and mini market/post office/pharmacy

- One representation has been received in regard to employment/tourism at Titchmarsh Marina and Walton Mere, Walton

Promoter – owners (Agent Collins & Coward)

Submission – include specific policy references to support

- One representation has been received in regard to employment/tourism at Hutleys Caravan Park, St Osyth

Promoter – St Osyth Beach Estate Ltd (Agent Boyer)

Submission – support for Objective 10 and tourism

- One representation has been received in regard to tourism at land north of Robinson Road, Brightlingsea

Promoter – J S Blyth & Sons Ltd (Agent Honace)

Submission – Propose mixed-use allocation to include holiday lodges

General Representations

Bourne Leisure Ltd (Agent Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners)

Representations comprise Vision & Objectives, Policies PP8, PP11, PPL1, PPL2 and PPL4.
Support for tourism and protecting environment

The Burghes Estate (Agent Berrys)

Amend settlement boundary between Frinton/Walton/Kirby Cross and Kirby-le-Soken . Policies SPL1, SPL2, LP1, PPL6 and Local Map 15. Frinton/Walton/Kirby Cross should have at least a further 350 dwellings.

Edward Gittins & Assoc.

Site selection and distribution. Representation – Development boundaries of Smaller Rural Settlements should be increased or made more flexible.

Hopkins Homes Ltd

There may be viability constraints associated with the 30% provision which would require greater flexibility. The third paragraph of the policy does not comply with the CIL Regulations or with Central Government Policy in that it suggests that there may be a lower percentage plus an unspecified pooled payment towards generally constructing affordable dwellings. The Council routinely asks for Gifted Affordable Council Houses and it would appear that there is a standard approach for such requests. The policy should be amended to state whether Gifted Council Houses are the proposals which "involve the provision of alternative forms of affordable housing" and be clear about what is required. Overall, the Policy does not appear to be consistent with national policy. It may lead to restrictions on the delivery of housing.

LP 7 does not accord with National Policy. The policy is vague, as is LP3.

Need to show a scenario of upper and lower housing estimates which includes more than just a variation in Weeley.

Full look at housing needs and wide range in the mix development to ensure all needs are catered for.

Kentucky Fried Chicken

Targeting Class A5 establishments is futile as even Class A1 shops sell foods which are high in fats, sugars and salts. There is no academic evidence to suggest proximity to fast food restaurants and obesity are linked

Merchant Projects Ltd

Land situated north east urban fringe of Clacton (Land of Centenary Way, C015 4UD) comprising of 5.43 ha capable of delivering 120 dwellings. 550 dwellings per annum appears to be a reasonable number but should be kept under review. It is our view that the plan should be more flexible to allow changes as the Local Plan does not seem sure in itself. Extra allocations should be made to ensure housing demands are met.

SP6, SP7, SP8 and SPL1 contradict themselves. They state the majority of housing growth will be within or adjoining to existing settlements, yet the Garden Communities project is a separate city and contradicts this.

We believe the council is too reliant on the success of the garden community. No viability model or assessment applied to the garden communities to see if it would be possible to build within the allotted time frame.

The plan is currently inflexible and therefore vulnerable to changes. Unrealistic delivery rates have been applied and the building works are centred on a few particular areas, which could result in nothing being achieved if these plans were to fail.

SP2 is too inflexible and should allow other sites the opportunity to expand. Centenary Way (CO15 4UD) is a good example.

We strongly suggest the land at Centenary Way (CO15 4UD) should be reconsidered for further development.

Mersea Homes

Propose a cross-boundary University Growth Area (UGA). Open ended framework is more flexible - can make changes during the build as well as add on after the build.

NEEB Holdings

We support the Council's stance on the provision of a safe and efficient transport network. New roundabout to be created west of Little Bentley.

We support the housing provision of 550 per annum as a minimum. We understand the importance of brownfield sites but it must be kept in mind that due to contamination, some of these sites are not possible to build on or have lengthy delays. Therefore, greenfield sites should also be bore in mind.

Fully support the upgrade of the A120 due to its importance to the economy of Tendring. Desire better services for drivers and passengers. The creation of a roundabout west of Little Bentley. This would create a convenient stopping point between Colchester and Harwich.

Supporting the proposed hierarchy but wish to stress the importance of development outside of defined settlement boundaries.

It is important to keep settlement boundaries flexible to align with changing economic and community views.

We support the plan and see many good things throughout.

Pommery Planning Consultants

Generally, support the proposed document. The illustrated settlement boundary for Great Bentley does not include all of the land that has been approved to be built on (16/00133/OUT). Furthermore, there is an approved cluster of houses that remain outside the settlement boundary. Is this a drafting error? If both of these areas are included into the settlement boundary, there would be an illogical gap between the current settlement boundary and the amended area. Therefore, the settlement boundary should be included to make one unified settlement area.

Mr C Richardson (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy SPL2 - object

Include land south of Heath Road, Tendring Heath for redevelopment.(cease use as haulage yard)

Martin Robeson (MRPP)

Objects to PPL6, supports Policy SP1, concerns re. Policies PP1, PP7 and PP14 comments re. Objectives 2 & 3, Policies HP1, HP4, LP1, LP5.

Stephen Rose (Rose)

Development boundaries of Smaller Rural Settlements should be increased or made more flexible.

Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (Agent Indigo Planning)

Submission – Policy PP4 - local retail impact assessment threshold outside of Clacton and Frinton should increase from 250 sq.m. to 750 sq.m.

Tim Snow Architects

The current plan fits with the current model of a sustainable approach but these can be susceptible to change and therefore there should be an element of flexibility in the Local Plan to accommodate for this.

St Helena Hospice

Build a retirement village. Accommodation for the frail and old. Everything contained within the village (pharmacy, health centre etc.). Would need good transport links into the surrounding towns of Harwich, Colchester and Clacton.

The village would employ a significant number of people through carers, shop assistants, health care professionals etc.

University of Essex

The University supports Policies HP4, PP12, CP1 and CP2.

The University also supports the notion of improving sustainable transport and accessibility measures. The University broadly supports the 'garden city' concept; this needs early completion of key road between A120 and the A133.

An area to the east of the University campus and B1028 is recommended for the future expansion of the University and its activities. This allocation is not, however, reflected in the draft Tendring District Local Plan.

The University recommends that infrastructure should come before the expansion of settlements.

Various (unnamed) clients (Agent Robinson & Hall)

Policy PP6 – object – ambiguous and unreasonable as written.

APPENDIX 4 - Community Representations

Consultation responses on behalf of Community Groups and Representatives – Part 1

Councillors

Councillor Julie Young – (Colchester Borough Councillor)

Essentially, Councillor Young objects to the garden city (west Tendring) development.

Councillor Tim Young – (Colchester Borough Councillor)

The Councillor is concerned to see Tendring building on the Colchester border. Councillor Young also wishes to see a 1.5km green gap. It is recommended that any development should catalyse A120 and A133 improvements. Health and education should be expanded. Support is given to the expansion of the University of Essex.

Town and Parish Councils and Residents Groups

Elmstead Market Parish Council

The Parish Council's concerns are around the proposed Colchester East/Tendring West Garden Development. Concerns are raised in regard to the eroding green gap between Colchester and Elmstead Market. The level and proximity of new development will affect the rural character and appearance of Elmstead.

Concerns also exist over the loss of open spaces, habitat, appearance and beauty of local countryside. It is stated there is regular severe congestion beyond the B1028 junction.

Other concerns the Parish Council would like addressed before the next consultation include increasing pollution and noise due to increased traffic flow through Elmstead Market. The Parish Council also raised concern over timing of development.

Frinton and Walton Town Council

SP2 – vary overstating housing needs. Change wording to “Each Authority will have a robust review mechanism of these numbers to deal with circumstances where under or over achievement is significantly affected by issues outside its control”.

SP4 – vary 7th bullet point should read “and expanded settlements” after the words ‘urban areas’.

SP5 – vary take ‘where appropriate’ out at the end of the 1st paragraph and finish the paragraph as “...design codes for large and strategic scale developments” to improve future developments.

SP6 – vary second paragraph, second line, replace “to avoid” with “there is no”.

Little Oakley Parish Council

Concerns regarding infrastructure in particular worsening bus service throughout District. Adequate parking spaces required for each development – one or two per house often not enough.

Other Organisations

University of Essex

The University broadly supports the 'garden city' concept; this needs early completion of key road between A120 and the A133.

An area to the east of the University campus and B1028 is recommended for the future expansion of the University and its activities. This allocation is not, however, reflected in the draft Tendring District Local Plan, which indicates a lack of coordination between the Councils. The University seeks further clarification.

The University recommends that infrastructure should come before the expansion of settlements.

The Wivenhoe Society

Wivenhoe Society suggests that the target of 920 annual builds for Colchester should be reduced to recognise that Colchester has already provided more houses proportionately than others in the country and region.

The primary concern of Wivenhoe residents is the impact of the garden settlement on the A133, road infrastructure and routes into Colchester. The A133 is already severely congested at peak times. A route connecting the A133 to the A120 could provide some alleviation.

The Wivenhoe Society states that traditionally new garden cities were developed from small settlements where there are existing facilities to serve initial development stages – this would not be the case for East Colchester / West Tendring.

The new development would effectively be an expansion of Colchester. There is no existing infrastructure on the site north of the A133.

Residents are concerned about timing or provision of health facilities and schools in terms of possible adverse impacts of facilities in the early years before a critical mass of housing is built. Provision of a country park is welcomed as are indoor leisure facilities.

The Society states that in the Sustainability Appraisal the impact on agricultural land is masked by the assessment of other impacts and has therefore been given an amber rating.

The Society suggests that Weeley could possibly be expanded. This would require less transport fixes, the impact on heritage sites and wildlife would be no greater and this could help the economy of Clacton.

A second strategy would be, to put the east Colchester / west Tendring on hold until 2033, by which time experience of developing garden cities would be gained. Wivenhoe Society suggests that the development at Marks Tey should be put in place at a faster rate to allow the infrastructure

to support the new development to be put in place at an earlier date. Tendring could increase its allocation for Weeley and possibly expand some of the other settlements served by the rail line.

Consultation responses on behalf of Community Groups and Representatives – Part 2 Councillors

Councillor Rosemary Heaney

Councillor Heaney objects to Tendring Central development which was previously proposed for residential development in the Issues and Options paper.

Councillor Daniel Land

Considers, his area has to take a proportion of growth but that the distribution of housing in Weeley is too high. There is a lack of shops and services in the area and the level of development proposed would lead to detrimental visual amenity. Transport issues are also highlighted with a knock-on effect to neighbouring villages. The village will lose its identity and residents human rights are being decreased.

He considers house building in the District has not achieved that proposed in the emerging plan and he believes that this will not change. The Councillor considers that Weeley should be revisited as a proposal in this plan and other more suitable areas should be considered.

Town and Parish Councils and Residents Groups

Alresford Parish Council

The Parish is concerned over the road capacity and employment prospects within the District.

Brightlingsea Town Council

The Town Council recommends that the Coastal Protection Belt to the west of the settlement be extended north to include Wicks Wood and Lodge Wood to the All Saints Conservation area.

It is recommended that the Western Promenade is included as Safeguarded Local Green Space. The Town Council would like to see car parks designated on the proposals maps.

Frating Parish Council

Generally, supports the Local Plan as it will mean the District Council will have control over planning rather than landowners and developers.

The Parish understands that some sections of the plan will be met with strong resistance but the areas we have chosen for extensive development are suitable.

Infrastructure must be built before the houses though. The Parish is pleased to see 'Tendring Central' has been stopped.

Frinton and Walton Town Council and Frinton Residents Association

SPL1 - Vary if Weeley is to be an expanded settlement.

Reason: Recognition of the state, size and suitability of the B1033 must be addressed eastwards.

SPL3 - Vary Part B, point a); add following words after "Highway Network". *"as existing before the development"*.

3.1 Vision for Tendring - Vary Frinton-on-Sea to be designated a *Town by the Sea*.

Rural Heartland - Vary Change opening sentence after Brightlingsea to read *" , the expanded settlement Weeley along with some of the larger villages will have seen some significant levels of new housing"*

HP1 - Vary a) Add *"The Clacton and Harwich (Fryatt) Hospitals, the existing and proposed Medical Centre are maintained and expanded to meet the needs of the expanding population."*

Reason: To safeguard, maintain and improve our existing and future Health Facilities.

HP3 - Vary Add at end of first paragraph: *"which includes green gaps and green wedges."*

Reason: To strengthen the Policy.

LP3 - Vary at end of first paragraph insert after "regard to" *"and will be in line with"*.

b) Add to end of first sentence *"but each development must have significantly higher average achievement."*

d) Finish sentence after the word *"development"* with: *"to sustain and improve that of the immediate area"*. Insert new item g) *"That all large developments must have highways, raised curbs and footpaths built to a standard that can be adopted by the Essex County Council."*

Reason: To improve our future housing stock. Insert new item h) *"Housing mix should recognise and reflect the age Demographics of the District, with priority given to increasing the housing stock of bungalows"*.

Reason: To ensure housing stock is appropriate to local needs.

LP5 - Vary in the 3rd paragraph, penultimate and final lines. *Remove the bracketed text after council housing.*

Reason: So that Council, Social and affordable housing is equally distributed.

LP6 - Vary section headed The Content of Schemes: Keep 1st sentence *"A proposal shall cater for local needs."* remove rest of paragraph section headed Secure arrangements, point c: Remove *"over a wider geographically area"* substitute *"within the Tendring District"*.

Reason: To avoid doubt and strengthen Policy.

LP7 - Vary incorporate point c. in the 2nd paragraph after *“existing dwelling”* on the 3rd line, starting *“or involving ...”* Remaining points a. and b. should have an *“or,”* between them.

LP10 - Vary Create two new use classes (It can be done!) These clauses to be used in paragraph three and four as appropriate *C2b = same as C2 without hospitals, Nursing Homes and extra- care homes for Mental disability.*

Reason This is to apply to new build and Conversions INSIDE settlement limit boundaries. *C2c = Hospitals, Nursing Homes, extra-care Homes and secure Residential Institutions for Mental disability. This to apply for new developments and conversions at least 400m from settlement boundaries.*

Reason So that authorities and staff can deal fully with the patient needs.

Objective 2 Remove Offshore Renewable Energy. Add Tourism, SME's.

Reason We have not been able to attract any interest and the contracts for further offshore wind farms have gone elsewhere.

PP1 - Vary remove Walton-on-the-Naze.

Reason Not true Aldi is coming to Town!

PP3 - Vary Start paragraph 6.36 with the following replacement sentence: “There are other small parades of shops across the town and rural areas that are of neighbourhood significance but do not meet the definition of a centre.....”

In the preamble to PP5, the quoted definitions from the NPPF for “Primary Shopping Frontage” and “Secondary Shopping Frontage” are wrong. It would seem Officer comment or interpretation may have been added.

PP5 - Vary add point g; *Any change of use will be considered against the aims of this policy.*

Reason: To protect the reduction of A1 usage and to maintain the integrity of our High Streets.

6.5 Delivering Economic Prosperity.

2nd paragraph (6.55) add after A137, B1033

Reason 15%+ of the TDC population live to the East of Weeley. 3rd Paragraph (6.56) 3rd line, remove have replace with choose thus reading *“choose to Commute”*. Where is the necessary emphasis on Leisure and Tourism in the Delivering Economic Prosperity pre-amble.

PP6 - Vary The Policy for use of redundant Farm Buildings needs re-wording.

Reason Possibly too prescriptive and conflicting with the aim of regenerating Rural economies thus not achieving its objective.

PP7 - Vary? No comment on proposed allocations but perhaps consider Walton Mere to be added

as this is on the Policy Map as a Priority area for Regeneration.

PP9 - Vary Remove the whole policy and re think.

Reason This policy will limit development and/or conversions to Hotels, and will possibly encourage more hostel style properties. The free economy must be allowed to function unhindered. We cannot straight jacket businesses. If we do, the professional small Hoteliers will go elsewhere. Large Hoteliers will still develop, produce mediocre buildings and services, and we will lose the character encouraged by smaller concerns.

PP10 - Vary Add Recreational Vehicle Parks.

Reason There is great need for specific places for overnight parking for RVs.

PP11 - Vary We support this but would ask officers to strengthen the last three paragraphs wherever possible.

PP12 - Vary in objective 2 of "Prosperous Places" we suggested Removing Renewable energy and inserting Tourism and SME's. The first paragraph of this policy should therefore include reference to these industry training/skill requirements. Add to the end of last paragraph the words: "and prioritise employment of local people".

Reason to ensure "improving Education and skills" reflects our needs.

PP13 - Vary in point c. change "essential" to "key".

Reason Is there another Policy that will allow for individual dwellings of significance to be created from redundant farm buildings?

PP14 - Support Add after Community safety and accessibility, "The B1033 is key to Walton development"

7 Protected Places in first bullet point of pre-amble, change completely to: *"minimising the risk to human life, property and countryside from flooding and coastal erosion."*

PPL1 - Vary Remove the Exception test paragraph and then add this sentence to The Sequential Test. *"Any allocated sites in flood risk zones 2 and 3 should be removed from policy and local maps"*.

PPL3 - Vary Take out the word "native" from bullet point d. add bullet point f. *"green gaps and green wedges"* Add this sentence after point f.: *"Any proposed works on the above will be require a specific Planning application."*

Reason will strengthen policy.

PPL5 - Vary The word "should" appears three times in the first two Paragraphs. These to be changed to "must".

Reason will strengthen policy.

PPL6 - Vary the word “AND” should also appear between a. and b.

Reason will strengthen policy.

PPL7 - Vary remove the words “*desk-based*” from first paragraph.

PPL8 - Object We believe the old policy should be incorporated instead of this one. Replace with the whole of policy EN17

Reason will strengthen policy and EN17 has been shown to work

PPL12 - Object We believe the old policies should be used. Replace this policy with the whole of FW5 and FW6, including the pre-amble from the 2007 plan which adds strength.

Reason Is a stronger policy with more conditions and has been shown to work.

8.2 Improving Transport network: Penultimate paragraph (8.20) *add the B1033.*

Reason 15% of population of TDC live to the East of Weeley and need better infrastructure.

CP2 - Vary in the third bullet point, full stop after permission and remove rest of paragraph. Now reads: “Proposals that would have adverse transport impacts will not be granted planning permission.”

Reason This will allow infrastructure to be driven by a County and District Strategic Plan and not be driven by developers’ specific applications.

8.3 Improving the telecommunications network 3rd paragraph (8.24) add after “*coverage*” within the bracket, “*plus any new technologies that will occur in the lifetime of this plan*”

9 Delivering Infrastructure Three times in the table showing ECC, Public Utilities etc. and Health Authorities the word “*liaising*” is used in our view inappropriately. Replace with the word “agree”.

Reason: Liaising ends up as lip service. This plan must be robust and serve the needs, demands and wants of the population of Tendring. Add CQC as a consultee for health and care provisions.

10. Monitoring and Review

Sentence before bullet points: after the word “monitored” add “*and reviewed*”

Reason: We see where monitoring will take place but not review.

Appendix C - Local Maps The detail cannot be fully checked on the maps for our Town area as the scale and thickness of lines can be confusing. The quality of local maps must be up to the standard set by the 2007 local maps.

Great Bentley Parish Council

The Preferred Options Consultation Document Section C, Local Maps, page 200, shows a map of Great Bentley. The Parish Council's new allotments site located to the south of the Plough Road Industrial Centre is not shown and is outside the proposed village boundary. The Parish require that this is amended.

Great Bromley Parish Council

The Parish Council was broadly very supportive of the Preferred Options Document and only noted a couple of typographical errors to be addressed.

Harwich Town Council

The Town Council raised concern over the loss of parking at the Harwich Football Ground site, should this be carried forward for residential development.

The Town Council also consider that any development at the Mayflower School would be unacceptable.

Support is given to the Harwich School who intend to deliver sixth form facilities on their site.

The Town Council continues to support development at Horsley Cross for employment uses. The infrastructure provision in Harwich is noted as needing an upgrade. It is considered that the existing community, leisure and sports facilities are already at capacity. Similarly, car parks, public transport facilities and improvements to the A120 are all required.

The Town Council also have concerns over the provision for healthcare and education in the area.

Kirby-le-Soken Parish Council

The Parish Council submitted their draft Parish Plan and Village Design Statement. They require that this plan is adopted by the District Council as part of the Development Plan.

Lawford Parish Council

The Parish Council confirms their status within the Preferred Options Document as a Smaller Urban Settlement.

Concerns were raised that an increase in house prices forces young people out of the local housing market. The level of affordable housing and the need to keep families in the same area was also questioned.

Concerns raised over the number of speculative applications which have been approved in this area.

The Preferred Options Local Plan states that the area could accommodate 520 dwellings, yet the area has planning approvals for 935 homes. A note should be made of these approvals and no further applications should be approved.

Concerns were raised in regard to development at Brantham and East Bergholt. Concerns also raised over traffic and GPs with regard to the out-of-district development. It is stated that there are no sixth form places at the Manningtree Academy. A requirement to build sixth form facilities is promoted by the Parish Council.

Requirement to mention the GP surgery at Ardleigh. Solar panels on new homes should be promoted. Solar farms should directly benefit the settlements they impact.

A request is made to lower the threshold of housing on any site where contributions toward open space are sought. The Parish Council requires that Policy LP2 is amended to allow for full details of dwelling size, type and tenure to be seen at outline application stage.

Concerns are raised with regard to the vulnerable nature of an ever-growing elderly population and the opportunistic crime that this may allow. A requirement is made for new residential development to incorporate new retail premises.

Concerns are raised in regard to traffic and lack of capacity at railway stations in the area. A requirement that the plan should state what particular measures will be supporting and what dialogue will take place with the responsible authorities. A requirement is also made to engage with the Haven Gateway and Heart of Essex Strategic Transport board.

General support is given to both the Crockleford Garden Village and Weeley expanded village developments. Some concerns were made from residents of Tendring village to the Weeley proposals. Amidst these is the suggestion that Crow Lane is designated as a protected lane.

A system of 'post occupancy review' is recommended.

Little Bentley Parish Council

It is recommended that the Plan puts in place provisions to upgrade current infrastructure (particularly road and rail) before sustained development. The Parish also requests the expansion of the village envelopes to expand villages slightly.

Little Clacton Parish Council

Numbers of dwellings are flawed, the Parish urges TDC to reconsider a more even distribution especially to the northern A120 / A133. Planned distribution towards Clacton unworkable as infrastructure not in place.

A120 / A133 offers the best option for residential and business. Better use of disused brownfield sites will take traffic away from villages.

The Parish feels the area proposed as an extension of Oakwood Park needs to have green wedge in the way of a Local Wildlife Site (LoWS) as this would accommodate the displacement of wildlife. Suggest northern boundary of this area be a green zone.

Policy LP6 is too ambiguous, not robust enough to protect rural exception sites. No safeguard in

LP6 to protect rural exception sites. The 50 dwellings maximum must be added.

The Parish argues that the District Council reinstate safeguards from Policy SD3 into Plan, to protect rural exemption sites.

Within Little Clacton map, area of Engaines School is not shown as protected Public Open.

The Parish also objects to land west of Thorpe Road, Dalau site being proposed as employment zone as this area is green gap.

Little Oakley Parish Council

Concerns raised regarding employment and in particular that the housing allocated for Harwich would not deliver employment. Concerns regarding healthcare provision especially at Clacton and Harwich hospitals which are under-utilised.

The density and levels of parking at new developments was questioned. A requirement of tradespeople and visitor parking at new developments was put forward. A request is made that affordable housing is set aside for local people.

A proposal for a new marina in Harwich is put forward. Concerns regarding drainage and surface water flooding are raised.

Mixed views are given in regard to renewable energy, a subsection made to incorporate solar panels into new build properties. A four-way junction at Gt Bentley was suggested.

Manningtree Town Council

The Town Council repeatedly questions the amount of school spaces and state that schools are currently at capacity. There is no positive impact for the new train station. A station at Brantham (Suffolk) would be better situated. It is stated that there is too much congestion within the plan, especially in regards to the train station. The Town Council supports the Authority's approach to green spaces.

Mistley Parish Council

The Parish makes the comment that Mistley Place Park and the surrounding areas are Protected Open Space and Strategic Green Gap within the 2007 adopted Local Plan and should remain as such. Infrastructure improvements are also required to support any new development.

The Parish suggests the amalgamation of policies LP3 and LP4. It is also recommended that housing density should only be higher on ex-industrial sites in order to protect wildlife. The Plan should do more to encourage doctors to set up practices in the District. Support is given to the concept of 'local housing for local people'.

Primary shopping areas need to be protected from being turned into housing – especially public houses, so PP5 policy on Town Centre Uses needs to be strengthened to reflect this.

The A137 railway crossing and underpass is an issue. This is often used when the A12 is closed after an accident.

Ramsey and Parkeston Parish Council

The Parish Council requests all development sites to be listed.

The Council request that St Michael's Church (Local Map 20 – Harwich and Dovercourt) is listed within the Heritage Assets within the Draft Local Plan. The Council would also like to see the site at Mayes Lane Ramsey (dismissed at appeal) to be indicated as an area of Safeguarded Local Green Spaces. Also the Parish requires that the proposed Linear Park sited north of the A120 is reinstated.

Ramsey and Parkeston Parish Council supports land West of Mayes Lane being removed from the Draft Local Plan. They also would like to request that land South of Ramsey Road, Ramsey is removed from the Local Plan due to sustainability issues, water mains, flooding, electricity and pressure on schools.

St Osyth Parish Council

In principle, support is given to the Preferred Options document.

Thorpe-le-Soken Parish Council

Concerns regarding a planning application for 350 residential units at Thorpe Hall and the detriment to the Historic Garden as a result are raised.

Thorrington Parish Council

The Parish council has no specific concerns with the Local Plan.

Weeley Parish Council

Weeley Parish Council objects to all housing and mixed use allocations within the Preferred Options Local Plan. It is stated that Weeley and Weeley Heath should be considered as a single settlement.

Concerns are raised that there has not been an objective assessment of Weeley's suitability for significant additional growth. The settlement of Weeley does not feature significantly in the Preferred Options Document and little consideration is given to the best and most versatile agricultural land.

Concerns with regards to infrastructure in Weeley including; GP surgeries and healthcare are of concern in the area. Education is also highlighted as a concern as there is no secondary school in the area. Poor public transport links and little employment opportunities are highlighted in the village.

Also the lack of skills in Weeley means that employment opportunities are further curtailed. Concerns are also raised in relation to the difference in housing numbers at Weeley when

considering the upper and lower OAN.

The Parish states that the settlement boundary between Little Clacton and Weeley is confusing. The Parish also considers that more services in Weeley will not help it and that the loss of identity will still take place. It has requested that the plan specifically states the vision for Weeley.

Weeley Residents Association

The Residents Association states that the Preferred Options Document as drafted is unsound. The Plan is not positively prepared and does not put forward a strategy that would meet objectively assessed needs. The Plan is considered to be unjustified as alternative options were not considered and the Sustainability Appraisal was prepared after the Preferred Options Document. It is also considered that the Preferred Options Document is not effective as it does not demonstrate how it will be deliverable over its lifetime. It is also claimed that the document is incompatible with national planning guidance as it does not promote sustainable development.

Concerns are raised that the spatial strategy for the Part 1 and Part 2 Plans are incompatible. Questions are raised as to the soundness underpinning the Settlement Hierarchy.

The 'uplift' in dwelling numbers at Weeley is questioned and the unique nature for this 'uplift' at Weeley alone is queried. It is considered that this is not a sustainable pattern for development. It is also claimed that the Council has not satisfied its Duty to Co-operate.

Concerns are raised in relation to inconsistencies within the Settlement Hierarchy. It is questioned if Strategic Environmental Assessment will still be required post BREXIT.

Weeley has poor transport connections A133/A120 gridlocked at both peak times and holiday season. B1441 Weeley By Pass / B1033 Colchester Road / Thorpe Road is already congested, irresponsible to propose large scale developments in these areas. It would be unsafe to formulate local plan based on erroneous statistics from recent 'assessments' and 'surveys' where irrelevant, inaccurate and incomplete data was recorded. An increase in traffic numbers would reach an unmanageable level. Congestion impacts quality of life and environmental problems, workers have problems accessing labour markets and employment.

Tourism - Local villages and coastal areas need routes to get access anywhere inland, small feeder roads are not designed to accommodate huge traffic volumes. It is also stated that Weeley railway station is very small with poor facilities.

The Association states that the proposed plan will be detrimental and compromise local agricultural employment. Poor infrastructure could impact the economy, it is stated. The emerging policy should support growth, not turn agricultural land into building sites.

The Plan would disregard and override 'loss of valued community facilities and services' aspirations (contrary to NPPF document). Lack of proposed space per site would result in over expansion of the village. Rural landscape would change beyond recognition causing irreversible and overriding harm to the environment. It is also stated that the NHS has limited facilities at present. Weeley currently has no GP surgery or pharmacy in the immediate area. Green spaces

that already exist will soon be built over with no room for any future replication.

Buildings, road surfaces and other hard surfaces would be detrimental to a 'wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits' it is stated. (required by NPPF)

Building proposed up to holiday park boundaries which may influence holidaymakers deciding where to take their holidays. Concerns are also raised in regard to existing local sewerage problems.

Suggestion is made that Weeley is left as a village with just its currently accepted planned local expansion. Whole proposed development could be relocated to Horsley Cross.

Wix Parish Council

Concerns are raised that Policy HG1 contradicts Objective 6 of the Preferred Options Document. The Parish Council welcomes the reference to public houses in paragraph 4.17.

Concerns are raised that an approved application will offend the draft Backland policy contained within the emerging Preferred Options Document.

The Parish Council suggests a cycle and footpath should be delivered along the A120 from Parkeston to the Hare Green junction on the A120.

Concerns are also raised in relation to the lack of adequate infrastructure in the smaller villages including drainage and surface water flooding. The capacity of the highway network is also a concern for the Parish Council.

Wrabness Parish Council

The Parish supports inclusion of Rectory Road playing field as green space. However, the Parish objects to the designation of railway cutting to the north of Station Road.

A request is made for 0.2 ha of land immediately west of Wrabness. Village hall is mapped as proposed Safeguarded Green Space. Similarly, a request is made for the Station Masters Garden area at Station Road should be safeguarded as Local Green Space. The Parish strongly recommends the designation of Wrabness Station Yard as a local wildlife site be reviewed.

Other Organisations

British Horse Society

Repeatedly asks for more bridleways; better access and networks between bridleways and infrastructure, including to the coast; and new infrastructure that is available and accessible for all rather than just cyclists and pedestrians.

Other comments include: making green grid/infrastructure public; equestrian supportive tourism; equestrian access to coastal path.

CAUSE

CAUSE has put forward a transit-oriented development proposal called 'Metro Plan for Colchester and Tendring'. It is based around the under-utilised public transport spine of the Colchester - Clacton railway. CAUSE believes that more emphasis should be given to the excellent public transport linkages offered by the Colchester-Clacton rail line. CAUSE's Metro Plan enables the priority areas of Clacton and Walton-on-the-Naze to connect by a 4 hourly metro train service.

Colchester Institute

The Institute are fully supportive in their four comments made.

Essex Bridleways Association

The association repeatedly asks for: more bridleways; better access and networks between bridleways and infrastructure; and new infrastructure that is available and accessible for all rather than just cyclists and pedestrians.

Other comments include: making green grid/infrastructure public; equestrian supportive tourism; and the future maintenance of infrastructure to be set aside by the developers.

Frinton and Walton Heritage Trust

The Heritage Trust particularly supports the continuation of the Avenues Special Character Area policy.

Questions are also raised around the AON and the Peter Brett report. Moreover, the level of growth proposed is not supported by infrastructure.

The Harwich Society

Supports policies PPL7, PPL8 and PPL9 and states that it is essential that conservation continues to be promoted positively in the Local Plan.

The Society has concerns over infrastructure and suggests that the demand for infrastructure needs to be assessed and not left until the planning application stage.

Objections are raised to Policies HP1, HP2, CP2, PP5 and Section 9 - Delivering Infrastructure.

Ontrack

Ontrack highlights the importance of the use of land along rail corridors and parcels of land which are undeveloped by stations or railway facilities. This land should be kept clear of development to encourage the expansion of existing stations such as Thorpe Le Soken or Walton. Also, the possibility of the reinstatement of a second track at Harwich Town is suggested. Potentially new stations at Gorse Lane, Great Clacton and the potential reopening of Brightlingsea station are all suggested.

APPENDIX 5 – Members of the Public

Members of the Public – Part 1 – North Essex

1. Should not build in Weeley, should build on Colchester Fringe
2. Map C8 is not clear and therefore the people of Elmstead Market cannot fully appreciate the impact of the garden community. No mention of improved A133 through Clinghoe Hill where there will be added congestion on a strained route already.
3. Members of the Public wish to live in Elmstead as a village, not a town like Colchester which they fear it will become.
4. “Large estates of affordable housing will encourage more unemployed people to come and live in the Tendring area and this could lead to an increase in crime”
5. 9000 new homes will not make anyone happier or healthier. Increased traffic problems. Communities are being sacrificed in a relentless quest to concrete over what is left of our beautiful countryside
6. Our school and doctor and hospital cannot cope. Let's have a new hospital instead. Inhabitants want to be Elmstead, not Colchester
7. Inhabitants are very unhappy with the eroding of the green gap. Exhibitions need to be improved with more guidance for members of the public. No timescales given for building tranches.
8. General objection to building in Tendring due to too many people entering the country and draining resources.
9. The MOD land that has been released South of Colchester should be used rather than allowing Colchester to build in Tendring.
10. The building sites proposed are too close to Elmstead. People are not getting what they expected to be getting from their house due to the surroundings. Council taxes will be higher, more police will be needed along with street lighting, waste disposal, sewerage, etc.
11. Alresford is considered sustainable due to the infrastructure yet the service frequency is so limited it is unreasonable to ask this of the area. Fears over when the infrastructure will be put in, before or after the houses are there? There are not enough bungalows for the elderly. Many do not want a large house yet cannot find suitable accommodation. Roads are not built at suitable times to alleviate traffic from houses. Train network needs upgrading
12. Any new homes heading away from Salary Brook should be over the hill so they are out of sight. Any land east of Colchester would be unpleasant and create an unmanageable sprawl. Local and national policy should seek to enhance or preserve rural environments. If building has to happen east of Colchester, Salary Brook should have a 1.5 km green belt

around it to preserve its beauty. (repeated)

13. Concerns over most houses being on greenfield rather than brownfield. Far too much over development and potential for rural villages just turning into a conurbation.
14. As Tendring District Council has not met housing needs for years, there obviously is not enough demand for houses. Colchester will reap all the benefits of commerce etc. If the area becomes part of Colchester, they will get the tax benefits of the new houses. The garden community would result in a loss of the best and most versatile farm land. There is silica sand in this area. The only such area in the whole of Essex. Development around Crockleford Heath would destroy the rural landscape and culture.
15. A notation of what infrastructure should be considered for the process of the plan. Does the council have the support of NHS England and Highways?
16. Inhabitants went to an exhibition in Jaywick Lane and the members of Tendring District Council who were there seemed thoroughly unprepared. No Councillors were at these meetings. Any plans for Clacton hospital? Is it going to close?
17. The road outside Elmstead is fast and dangerous. Adding more houses will make it worse. Additional safety measures must be put in place.
18. Area between Colchester and Salary Brook is of particular attraction to wildlife and local population. Building on Colchester Fringe will exacerbate its problems. The overall plan is not ambitious enough. It does not make significant impacts in deprived areas. It is a compromise plan.
19. The plan is an obvious attempt to destroy Salary Brook Valley. There are fields behind the valley which would be better suited to houses.
20. Nothing is planned for Clacton. Where will Tendring District Council put the criminals? Less police too.
21. Climate change means building on arable GB is stupid. Communities are being disrupted. This should be questioned.
22. Jobs should be top of the list. Followed by schools, roads, transport and doctors. Tendring is a selection of villages. By building 11,000 homes, they will be towns. These settlements will be in chaos.
23. The government only cares about the rich counties. Roads are very poor.
24. Only the builders and wealthy will benefit from this.
25. Put in place broadband that Local Government agreement insists on.
26. Colchester is an ancient town and inhabitants should not change it.
27. It is suggested that as Elmstead Market is a dispersed settlement infilling could ruin the

character of the village and estate development would overwhelm it. It is suggested that the protection of Elmstead Market's visual, historical and archaeological qualities should be supported.

Members of the Public – Comments specific to Weeley

1. There would be a destruction of green space including habitats. Weeley needs to stay as a village. The rural landscape would be irreversibly ruined.
2. There will be huge amounts of car pollution due to the extra 3000 cars. Added traffic and congestion. Frequency of bus and rail services is limited. Building in Weeley contradicts SP1, SP 4, SP 5 and SP 6.
3. The new settlement is not far enough away to be considered a free standing settlement.
4. Fears of overdevelopment beyond sense. Tendring District Council must create a sensible and more acceptable plan.
5. Is there any point in the SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment) as this is required by EU law yet we are not to remain in the EU? Same idea for the Habitats Regulation Assessment. EU has lied to us for years and therefore anything Tendring District Council acts on, regarding what the EU have said, would be flawed and based on fiction. Weeley station is not good enough to cope with commuters and train travellers. Weeley does not have a doctor's surgery or pharmacy. Tourism will suffer in the region. Caravan/holiday parks are the sole income for many parts of the district and these plans will hamper this. Local sewerage problems are already unmanageable and unhealthy. It already seeps up into gardens and fields.
6. Roads and hospitals need improvement.
7. Effect on local schools, roads and infrastructure will be huge. They need improvement.
8. This is too many houses for the need in Weeley, a farming and tourist area. From one member of the public's research, the levels of unemployment in Tendring were around 8% (double the average for Essex). 20% of children live in poverty and 20% of citizens live in seriously deprived areas.
9. 800-1100 does not constitute a new garden settlement, especially as it is attached to a currently formed and established settlement. A garden village is 1500-10,000 new homes that is not attached to an existing settlement.
10. Air quality will be diminished causing a drop in health of locals.
11. Conflicting numbers in regards to how much new construction is marked as employment sites. SP 3 says 40 ha. PP 7 says 63.28 ha. 10 ha of this would be based in Weeley and this is unacceptable to the residents of Weeley. Extending the village boundary would destroy the village and the local habitats. The plans for Weeley are not within the spirit of the NPPF.

Road improvements proposed would not even alleviate the traffic problems in their current situation. The plan repeatedly contradicts itself. The building works for the new garden community in west Tendring appear disproportionately small compared with Weeley. The building does not contribute or enhance Weeley nature, built or historic environment. St Andrew's church would lose its setting. People who do not live in the village do not have the right to change its nature and identity against the vast majority of inhabitants wishes. Large scale development will increase the already high risk of flooding in Weeley.

12. Plan is ambiguous and aimed at the whims of developers and Westminster not local residents. Houses being built are substandard as the Council has reduced the minimum size of a house.
13. Weeley Heath and Weeley village are one entity, not two.
14. What will happen to the 4000-year-old stone circle just north of Weeley?
15. Better option than Weeley would be: 2 Barnfields, 1 Barnfields and The Tudors. Better connections here with road and rail. Aesthetically, the best option in the area too.
16. Tendring should consider reintroducing prefabricated housing.
17. Why build houses at the end of the country and the end of the train line?
18. Objects to the Hartley Gardens as this would be overdevelopment, believes that infrastructure will be inadequate and will be unfair on local residents. Suggests Weeley is a better option, or development along the A120.

Members of the Public – Part 2 – Tendring – Comments not specific to Weeley

1. The majority of jobs within Tendring only pay the minimum wage and this will surely have an impact on the type and price of houses that are required for those employed in Tendring.
2. Concerns about GPs surgeries in Holland on Sea and Clacton and recruitment of GPs
3. Concerns expressed about affordable housing and how wage increases will be achieved
4. It is noted that in the Local Plan there is no development area marked for Sladbury's Lane.
5. Mayes Lane, Church Hill Old HAD5 appeal site, requests that this site be deleted from the 'PPL6 Strategic green gap policy' as currently shown on the policy map for Harwich and Dovercourt (including Parkeston and part of Ramsey).
6. The Local Plan needs to take into account what is happening in Suffolk, i.e. Brantham, East Bergholt as large developments in the south Suffolk will increase local traffic through to Lawford via A137. New developments in Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley need to take into account this increase in traffic.
7. SPL3 - Vision good but need people in place to make it happen. Building houses does not

create sustainable employment. Bathside Bay is only suitable as a Marina. More tip sites and recycling required. Affordable housing should only be available for local people. Drainage and sewerage inadequate. Add 4-way junction at Gt Bromley A133/A120. Need infrastructure in place. Harwich desperately needs a tourism vision, not a port or windfarms. A bridge from Harwich to Felixstowe.

8. A more proactive approach to employment and commercial activity is required especially in the Harwich area. More parking spaces per house needed. At least 2 hours free parking should be provided in car parks or on street to enable retailers to compete with out of town retailers. Development needs to be proportional to area. Improvements to A120. Pleased that Little Oakley is now classed as a rural settlement.
9. Better use needs to be made of the Harwich and Colchester hospitals.
10. No jobs to support large developments.
11. Supportive of Local Plan's strong protection of heritage of coast, estuaries, countryside and buildings. Supports the Local Plan in its recognition of the District's ecological assets being key to its attractiveness and tourist economy. To maintain the heritage requires funding and there needs to be a masterplan budget to accompany the Local Plan. Supports the proposed regeneration of Walton as well as the 30% affordable housing but is concerned about the Council's ability to achieve a quality outcome and control/regulate developers designs. The block development of the care home and planned destruction of the natural sloping landscape and its impact on the protected nature reserve at the former Martello Caravan site is alarming. It requires skilled teams of planners, urban designers and architects within the planning office. The formation of planning teams from across districts and counties might be an effective way to increase expertise, particularly regarding design quality. Need for clear planning directives, with self-certification becoming more common it would be more acceptable if published standards set the requirements for space allocation for storage, water capture and grey water recycling, etc. To achieve the 20-year Plan, TDC needs construction companies with local expertise well-schooled in contemporary technologies and construction techniques. Concern expressed regarding construction in vulnerable flood areas, detail is needed on preventative action. Suggests co-operation with other coastal authorities to enhance expertise and best practice must be developed. Suggests development sites should be open to competition to achieve the best design proposals. Concerned as to whether the Local Plan represents sufficient vision of the future in 20 years. Suggests that getting the infrastructure in place is a priority. Suggests the Plan does not adequately address sustainability and resilience to withstand impacts such as another sea surge, severe water shortage or power disruption. The Plan is positive and inspirational but should review negative impacts too and be prepared for the 'what-if' scenarios.
12. Suggests an extension of the settlement development boundary of Alresford as an alternative site for future development.

13. Requests that 82 houses are not build on Michaelstowe, in Ramsey.
14. Suggests amendment to the development boundary for Straight Road, Bradfield.
15. Suggests amendment to the plan for Bradfield regarding access to Bradfield foreshore.
16. Concern expressed about the inclusion of Bradfield Village Hall within the development area.
17. It is suggested that once the mineral extractions end at Crown Quarry, adjacent to Ardleigh Reservoir, the land bordering this area should be dedicated to the enjoyment of the public. Recognises that the Crown Quarry land is within the area designated as requiring protection from pollution of the water table but given the huge potential of the environmental benefits that will accrue, suggests that these should be recognised in the Preferred Options and that the area in question should be given 'green' space status. Suggests caution be exercised in permitting any further development of land to the east of Old Ipswich Road, Ardleigh.
18. Concern that there is nothing in the Local Plan that seriously addresses the lack of strategic road access to Manningtree and the North West Tendring villages, despite extensive developments that have been permitted in recent years. Problems are exacerbated when traffic is diverted during closures of the A12. Significant heavy traffic from Mistley Port and nearby industries in Lawford. Suggests that easing small vehicle flow through Manningtree station underpass with traffic lights is more likely to compound the problem. Concern that the roads towards the A12 and Ipswich are inadequate with the increasing volume of traffic. Similar concerns expressed about the main road through Manningtree through Ardleigh to Colchester. Concern regarding the significant traffic flow along Wick Lane, Ardleigh, a protected lane, to A12. Suggests a connection to the A120 at Ardleigh.
19. Strongly requests that the Policies Map and Local Maps are varied so that the land currently classified as Coastal Protection belt surrounding Brightlingsea continues to be included within the new Local Plan. Of particular concern is the proposed removal of the coast protection belt adjacent to the ancient woodlands of Lodge Wood and Wicks Wood, near the Manor Housing Estate and requests that this is included to help protect the character and visual amenity of the rural landscape. Suggests amendment of the Brightlingsea map to indicate Classified Ancient Woodlands and Local wildlife site of Wicks Wood and Lodge Wood. Suggests Policy PPL4 should be worded more strongly to take into account adjoining land that surrounds special protection areas and sites of special scientific interest including the protection of ancient woodlands, where building on adjacent land would cause adverse impact.
20. Suggests local people should decide the locations for developments and what growth is needed for their villages. Concern regarding potential bullying of villages, abuse of existing villages/towns, loss of identity of the area, loss of agricultural land. Suggests that children should be encouraged to look after the elderly. Comments that town centres are only active during the tourist season. Suggests that existing employment sites would be affected by proposed employment sites and that employment allocations should have been addressed a

long time ago. Comments that it has become easier and cheaper to buy online and that this is preferred by many people to the hassle of going to a shop. Suggests the rural economy should be decided by the locals. Suggest that tourist destinations such as Beth Chatto gardens should be protected and recognised. Asks whether it is wise to have hotels which will only be used during holiday periods and not very active at other times. Suggests education should be available and affordable to all, not just those on benefits. Suggests consideration should be given to the impact on flora and fauna and natural habitats should be respected that loss of green space and habitat is a serious issue. Suggests sustainable transport and accessibility and improving the transport network should have been tackled a long time ago. Comments that the cost of public transport is too high, that some people are housebound but may wish to comment, many people believe they are not being listened to because problems have existed for year and are only now taking an interest, e.g. people who cannot get out of their own drives due to heavy traffic need to be reassured that their problems are taken seriously. Suggests building a new town along the A12 instead. Suggests the reduced bus service through village could limit opportunities for residents of the new development. Comments about the submission document: The amount of information is huge, suggests separate sections to make it easier for people to understand and comment. Those unable to read the document should have been given the chance to comment too. Maps were not clear and the information not easy to understand.

21. Suggests that TDC is intent on destroying all of the small villages instead of invigorating the coastal areas. Suggests over development of small villages, i.e. Elmstead and Alresford. More green areas needed, not concreting over large areas of farmland and woods. Suggests small developments, not large estates and encouraging retail development in towns not in the countryside. Supports most of the Protected Places policies. Suggests that joining the A120 with the A133 would add to the existing congestion at Greenstead roundabout. Concerned that the problems with sewerage will get worse.
22. Suggests that there is not enough provision of facilities (healthy places) now; that it will encourage people to move to the area from London.
23. Suggests that there should be a greater emphasis on the opinions of Town and Parish Councils and to involve the community more. Concern that we will need to produce more food in future; suggests reducing the flow of housing and planning strategically according to a revised need; provide more compact units per build; place affordable housing strategically, i.e. closer to town and employment. Supports PPL1 and 2 but with wider consultation. Comments re PP10 to allowing only one application on any given site and a comprehensive description – local decisions become paramount. Regarding renewable energy generation, suggests preventing these where there is a risk of local objection and environmental hazard.
24. Concerned at loss of open spaces, particularly school playing fields. Suggests that further developments in Tendring at the levels proposed will overload the infrastructure and provision of services, education and healthcare. Suggests that in Appendix D Elmstead Market Churchyard should not be included, or the verges to Church Road, Elmstead Market

and Strawberry Grove.

25. Questions the suitability of putting developments where they will have a massive detrimental impact on existing infrastructure, existing population and their services. Suggests carrying out environmental assessments in all proposed areas and commitments being made to retain green spaces between rural areas that could be for ramblers, etc. Suggests room needs to be made for nature, or it will be lost. Suggests planning and developing alongside existing roads spread out around Tendring; to designate and develop our proportion of the 1.8m empty homes in the UK, which would release greenfield and agricultural land from development. Suggests concentrating on the service sectors, enlarge hospitals to meet new requirements, assisted living accommodation, holiday parks, water sports, marina, casino, build smaller less costly retirement accommodation that can also be used for first time buyers and young families.
26. Suggests vision is good but people need to be in place to make it happen and that building houses does not create sustainable employment. Also suggests that Bathside Bay is only suitable as a marina. Regarding HP1, comments that there are already not enough services. Suggests Harwich & Clacton hospitals need to be utilised and more tip sites and recycling needed; parking facilities for number of population/visitors/tradesmen. Comments that 'care' needs to mean 'care' – care homes do not supply 'care'. Supports PPL1, PPL2, PPL3 & PPL4 but comments that drainage and sewerage are currently inadequate. States that any development should be proportional/sensible. Suggests improvements to A120 including making A120/A133 junction 4-way to enable joining the A133 from Harwich which would reduce HGVs using B1414. Supportive of Little Oakley being classed as a rural settlement.
27. Suggests a more proactive approach to employment and commercial activity is required especially in the Harwich area; that health and wellbeing this will be one of the difficult areas to achieve and that better use of the Fryatt and Clacton hospitals should be on the agenda. Suggests more parking spaces need to be provided per house, so street parking is available for delivery and service trade vehicles and that affordable housing should be for residents who have lived in Tendring for at least 3 years. Comments that drainage and sewerage is inadequate in some areas already, that plans need to be robust for new developments and that they need to be proportional to the area. Suggests that a 4-way junction at Gt Bromley A133/A120 is needed and that infrastructure needs to be in place; doctors, roads, parking, business investment; that local hospitals need to be utilised and that Harwich needs a tourism vision not a port or windfarm. A bridge from Harwich to Felixstowe is also suggested.
28. Commented that notification for the exhibition dates arrived late, that the plans exhibited were printed too small to view them properly. Object to the building of the new estate next to Constable Avenue, Clacton as this will cause loss of quiet enjoyment of their property, general noise of the estate, inadequate provision of doctors, lack of policing and concerns about anti-social behaviour. Suggests that surrounding roads need to be widened and

properly maintained, that drainage and utilities need to be capable of withstanding the new estate; concern expressed about loss of agricultural land; lack of funding for the hospital; a need for dentists/chiropractic. Asks whether there will be a green space between their property boundary and the estate, e.g. for wildlife. Expresses concern about the jobs available, and concern about whether the Council can afford to pay benefits if there is no work available.

29. Objects to the Hartley Gardens as this would be overdevelopment, believes that infrastructure will be inadequate and will be unfair on local residents. Suggests Weeley is a better option, or development along the A120. Concern also about the loss of green gap between Clacton and Little Clacton.

30. Concern expressed about the removal of the Coastal Protection Belt at Brightlingsea.

31. Concerned about the erosion of the green gap between Clacton and Little Clacton, particularly along Centenary Way. Suggests that Little Clacton can accommodate new housing by that any development should be in the centre of the village. Recommends that land west of The Street, Little Clacton.

32. Concerned that the Tendring peninsula is in danger of being swamped by high new developments, destroying villages and associated communities. States that villages are an important and vital part of the community and British lifestyle and heritage. Many people cannot tolerate the prospect of living in built up areas which is why they move to villages. Is concerned that the existing infrastructure cannot withstand the proposed plan; that roads are extremely congested at certain times; the size of the proposed developments. Concern also expressed about loss of agricultural land, wildlife habitat, lack of employment opportunities, health services already in crisis, oversubscribed educational provision, loss of agricultural land, green spaces, bridleways and footpaths.

33. Does not oppose growth, however believes that the values and character of a village should be retained whilst embracing growth. Wants communities to become stronger and prosperous without detriment to the character of a village, i.e. retaining the green spaces. Believes that urban areas of Clacton and Harwich need to be expanded to bring improvement, at the moment they are run down and neglected. Suggests taking advantage of brownfield areas which will not only meet the demands but also regenerate the areas.

34. Concerned at the loss of green space and peaceful environment, lack of employment and encouraging people to move into the area from London.

35. Concern expressed about provision of infrastructure, surgeries, schools, roads, drainage and lack of employment opportunities.

36. Concerned about the effect of the large development proposed to the west of the bypass between Progress Road and Brook Retail Park and the increased level of traffic that will be created along Little Clacton Road. Seeks reassurance that a new road would be built to

mitigate this.

37. Concerned that their garden has been classified in one part safeguarded local green space and in another strategic green space and that this needs to be corrected.
38. Object to the development at Rouses Lane, St John's Road, Clacton as this will devalue property and wildlife will be lost, that the traffic network is not sustainable, sewers. Comments that there are no GPs surgeries, no jobs and that it will have a large impact on Tendring.
39. Suggests green areas need protecting. Concern that school places are running out.
40. Concerned that the proposed number of houses at Hartley gardens will not bring long term prosperity to Clacton and could lead to housing market saturation in view of the proposals for the west and north of the town.
41. Concern regarding traffic congestion at Frating roundabout, through Thorpe and Kirby Cross.
42. Commented that the maps are poorly defined and no mention of changes to the Brightlingsea Coastal Protection belt in the text and that there was no public meeting for Brightlingsea.
43. Resident pleased their property had been removed from the village envelope for future building options in Little Clacton.
44. Concerned at the timing of the delivery of the leaflet advising the exhibition dates and locations.
45. Hopes that the new plan has not come too late to stop the proposed Willow Farm Development. Concerned about the disruption and chaos caused if the development goes ahead.
46. Instead of creating more housing, we should be improving the facilities for our current residents. Concerned that village (Little Oakley) may become more like a town. Housing needs to be affordable for their generation.
47. Request a change be made to correct a minor cartographic error on a specific site in Station Road, Kirby.
48. Suggests PPL3 and PPL4 to protect both the rural landscape and biodiversity and geodiversity should be worded more strongly to take into account adjoining land which surrounds areas and sites of special scientific interest, including the protection of ancient woodlands, where development of adjacent land would cause an adverse impact.
49. Concern about the plans for 100's of houses in Kirby Cross and the surrounding areas. Do not think it appropriate to destroy the village and their way of life with mass housing. Have already lost the police station and coastguards, the libraries are part-time and the street

lights are switched off at midnight. If they had wanted to live in an overcrowded, noise polluted environment they would have chosen somewhere else to live.

50. Commented that the presentation of the Local Plan at Elmstead was very informative and well presented. Concerned about traffic and the number of parking spaces allocated to properties.
51. Advises that skylarks live and breed in the fields opposite Morrison's Supermarket and are protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. They are classified in the UK as a Red List species under the Birds of Conservation Concern review and as a priority species in the Biodiversity Action Plan.
52. Objects to the removal of green belt adjacent to north of Sackets Grove Caravan Park and the west of Jaywick Lane, known as Rouses Farm. In the 2012 draft plan a green belt between the proposed settlement development southern boundary and Sackets Grove Caravan Park had been incorporated as an amenity for both sites, and a distinct separation between both sites, in the latest plan this green belt has been removed taking away the amenity desirable for both sites. Secondly the green belt in the previous plan west of Jaywick Lane corresponded directly with the green belt east of Jaywick lane and was seen as a corridor for wildlife.
53. Supports the sites selected and outline in the plan as the most suitable locations for additional housing in the area.
54. States that the vast majority of residents in the district don't want more housing.
55. Suggests that the object of a consultation is to consider the views and aspirations of local residents and that you cannot empower local people if you bore them with terms like overarching roles. Also suggests the district plan meets very few infrastructure requirements and is unacceptable without all parties working together and considering the effect that these developments will have, accumulatively on the village of Thorpe. Comments that the previous plan and current proposals are much the same. That most young families in the area are on minimum wage and unable to save for a deposit and handicapped by rising prices. That the combination of developments in the Tendring area will adversely affect resident's free movements and ability to shop in the village of Thorpe. States that business will continue to close, that the turnover of shops in recent years has been unacceptable. Refers to the inadequate sewerage system and lists a number of highway issues stating that they will impact upon the schools and local facilities. Suggests that the proposals do not consider or provide any safeguards for the most affected village of Thorpe from developments in the golden triangle of Harwich, Walton/Frinton and Clacton. Suggests that the lack of a bypass will impact heavily on health and wellbeing, as well as future tourism. Comments re Hierarchies of Centres, stating centres have been defined for Clacton, Dovercourt, Harwich, Frinton, Walton and one assumes Kirby and asks what is the pivotal point between the centres? How does one traverse between them? Could it be at Thorpe Memorial? States that Thorpe is being classified as a rural centre and that the plan talks of

protecting it, how can that be when policies are being put in place that you know will deliberately destroy the village. Suggests having a level playing field and that the same consideration as Frinton, Walton and Kirby. Suggests that a one off levy be placed on every private and commercial development to contribute towards the damage to the village.

56. Commented that at the Jaywick exhibition maps and plans were difficult to decipher and Tendring employees were not able to answer questions being asked regarding provision of doctor's, etc., with tempers becoming frayed. Several people left unhappy. Help was not forthcoming in understanding the implication of the new plans, it was also noticeable that there were no Councillors present. Did not find the representation form easy to understand.
57. Suggests that the settlement boundary for Little Clacton be extended along Tan Lane to incorporate Crackstakes Farm.
58. Suggests access roads must be addressed, possibly a bypass to avoid all excess and heavy traffic before further housing is commenced. No objections to proposals in Policies HP1-4, as long as Council can prove it will deliver what's promised. Also suggests the numbers don't stack up, totals add to 11,000 not 10,000. Questions exactly how many properties will TDC start with and how does it all add up, i.e. 10149 dwellings over 17 years. TDC must demonstrate that these proposals are sustainable given that jobs/transport and community services are always limited. Asks how will the Council be seen to ensure that a fair and accurate carrying out of these requirements takes place. Will it be transparent? (LP1-6). Regarding Policy PP1, asks if this is in addition to the new retail outlets already happening in the area. Walton, Clacton, Manningtree, what about empty shops, Frinton, Walton, etc. Suggests Thorpe requires a car park. Comments that no mention is made of Thorpe Hall gardens, woods and surrounding fields under Heritage Assets. States that it is vital that any reports undertaken regarding wildlife/heritage sites, tree protection, bats, newts, owls, slow worms, is carefully considered in order not to upset the natural balance and that Historic England is kept informed.
59. Questions how any self-build plots will be allocated – companies or individuals. Suggests that indoor leisure activities should be introduced, museums and activities to occupy tourists in bad weather, i.e. art centres, pottery.
60. With regards to SPL1, comments not in Brightlingsea with only one twisting road as access.
61. Regarding policies LP1, LP5, LP8 & LP9, asks whether houses are actually needed, seeks clarification regarding back land and states that the rural economy has changed and making special provision for a minority exposes them to more difficulty. Suggests no more houses first to justify supermarkets. Asks if this means a transport service for all. States that wildlife corridors are important to prevent inbreeding and extinction of wildlife, and that planning permission should be required for pond in-filling and watercourse bank management. Comments also made on varying the siting of phone masts.

APPENDIX 6 – ‘post it notes’ Comments from Exhibition Attendees

The list below gives Members an understanding of the issues raised by the public at the exhibitions.

Comments received on “post it notes” at the 9 Public Exhibitions

- LP7 Suggested Policy fails to address the individual aspirational requirements
- Policy would result in effectively increase village development limits by 1.2km all around the village
- Would allow plot land style development
- Would destroy open character of countryside around village
- There is no provision for improving road network
- Existing access points via Colchester or Ipswich are unsuitable
- Direct access from A12/120 to support future development
- Poor access to this area additional rail services
- Drainage and sewage can't cope now
- Crow Lane very narrow for increased traffic
- Would not infilling up to the bye pass first be preferable? near the station and nearer Main Road
- Concern for Great Bentley and nearby areas especially Weeley –A vast Plan of housing
- Improve roads and repair potholes
- How many lorries are going to use Tendring Village and Crow Lane and Crown Lane?
- All I can see is rhetoric and subjective comments from the Council no facts and figures
- Infrastructure will not cope, it can't cope with high unemployment, lack of leisure facilities, sewage, and drainage is already at capacity
- Absolutely crazy, these plans are built on fantasy figures. Where we can cycle and walk everywhere and are well resourced for doctors, schools, police etc.
- If these plans go ahead it will kill off the wonderful Weeley Village life we enjoy-shame on you TDC
- Regulate cost effective train travel

- No infrastructure, roads, rail (Weeley closed on Sunday), doctors, school places
- No local jobs
- More Housing – Not affordable collapse of services Transport gridlock
- Weeley Village will be destroyed with knock on effect on Tendring - Roads are already gridlocked, local lanes are not safe for increased traffic
- Consider water table drainage etc.
- The obvious disadvantage to the Local Plan is lack of infrastructure with road links, medical facilities, education provision and lack of employment local opportunities
- A bye-pass to Frinton and Walton is a must before mass housing comes to Weeley
- Safe cycle paths in the area
- Infrastructure- doctors, Transport, schools and community facilities should be decided before further housing is discussed
- The proposals for massive development in Weeley will annihilate this lovely village and have a knock on effect for its neighbouring villages.
- The plans are against the wishes of the Weeley residents and the quoted numbers will not be meeting a local need
- Much needed farmland will be lost
- Infrastructure will not cope and Weeley's rural identity will be destroyed forever
- When will TDC and Essex Highways do "joined up writing!" I am not against new housing but roads/infrastructure should come first
- The roads can't cope now
- As for drainage there is no evidence of any maintenance/cleaning
- The Weeley development will totally swamp what already exists there and make it totally unrecognisable.
- What provision for employment, medical services, schools etc.?
- Has anybody had an intelligent thought about this proposal?
- Policy should allow for landmark (future listed) development in countryside
- Aspirational self-build and lifestyle choice should be recognised

- Control could be based on land area/%build links
- Give us doctors, hospitals and work -the infrastructure first not lots of houses and no work
- Colchester, Ipswich, London for work
- Not all Clacton-no work, no doctors, schools etc. (already have major stress on demand)
- Each village should take housing especially Elmstead Market, Lt Bromley, Gt Bromley, Wix, Wrabness as near good roads for access
- A community grows from within, forcing houses everywhere will only anger the residents and create more problems than it solves
- Too much intensive redevelopment in one spot will affect existing house prices detrimentally
- Need improved infrastructure, amenities, Doctors, jobs etc., before taking more people in
- What about better road infrastructure? The number of additional housing units in Clacton will give significant extra traffic.
- Cant keep building and building on farm land/green land we will have no green spaces left....is it all belonging to the same person
- Bockings Elm-1700 houses = 4000 more people. Sewage, water, the roads can't take the traffic. We are promised Doctors but it doesn't happen
- Keep Clacton hospital open!
- Have you thought about the elderly retired people with respiratory problems and what sort of provisions there are for the transport of those people to get to hospital? Also with all the pollution with cement and brick dust they will travel in the air causing more health problems.
- All very well building new houses but there are not enough jobs, shops, facilities to support this and infrastructure of roads not good enough to cope
- What about repairing awful state of Constable Avenue Road
- Residents are not listened to –Councillors have forgotten whose interest they should be representing
- Would query the value of some "Green Gaps" – due to the fact they are obscured from view, due to historical extensive foliage and are therefore only visible via an aerial view
- Where is the hospital, new schools, doctor's surgeries and new transport routes to cope with new residents?
- How are there going to be new jobs when most of this area is seasonal?

- Why are our green areas being taken?
- No doctors want to come here
- There is no work here so the traffic up to London will be horrendous with longer queues than now on the Weeley by-pass
- Before housing we need infrastructure, roads, schools, doctors and work for local people
- Less dependence on private cars. More proper employment, Full Police presence -on the beat not cars
- Concern that people commuting to London will shop there, train service not brilliant
- Who will the houses be for? feel we should develop Clacton as tourist area
- Police visible on the streets
- Another doctor's surgery would be nice
- Why is development being concentrated in one half of the district because most of the Councillors live in the other half and don't want it where they live
- Disgraceful - thousand years of history wiped out with Mistley and Lawford being merged to form a "Greater Manningtree"
- Railway crossing at Manningtree Station
- Parking needs to be addressed before more development goes ahead
- Must keep Green Areas between villages and try harder when it goes to appeal
- Please do something to improve the A137 where it goes underneath the railway line at Manningtree station, its getting worse
- Already 1 million empty houses in the Country. No jobs to support development
- Housing is needed for local people on low incomes, not London overspill
- There is not the infrastructure, services or employment required to validate this plan
- An utterly meaningless exercise as the local population's views are being ignored.
- Maps are meaningless and don't inform
- Railway/tunnel at bottom of Cox's Hill needs to be sorted
- When will Mistley Quay owners be made to improve the area? The unsightly fence,

rusty oil drums, broken foot paths derelict buildings etc.

- Traffic lights at Manningtree station – may make it safer there but many local people all dispute that they will improve the flow of traffic. Would it be possible to have a trial time with temporary traffic lights to monitor the effect, this may confirm or otherwise and perhaps save money?
- Mistley Manningtree Lawford and Brantham all CO11 post code we all need better roads and improved shopping
- TDC will still pass housing development as they wont pay for a Public Inquiry-too costly
- Sewage treatment works at Manningtree not able to cope with 1,000 more dwellings. Roads, school's surgeries inadequate.
- There cannot be new builds at the proposed levels unless there are better health services. Colchester hospital cannot cope, what is Tendring going to do about that – push for new hospital- make better use of existing facilities at Clacton and Harwich.
- Your” Sustainable Places” sheet is just pie in the sky
- Manningtree High Street is slowly dying –need more diverse shops
- Please sort out infrastructure and amenities before building more large ugly houses for commuters
- Wignall Street, Harwich Road Lawford totally inadequate for increased traffic
- Bromley Road is quite narrow and leads to Car Park will add to congestion. A footpath presently leads from the school to Dead Lane which is very rural. Several hundred homes in your “Preferred Options” will make life unbearable for new comers as well. Infrastructure is inadequate. The trees are protected
- Green Wedge north of Long Road Lawford must be retained for recreational use – parkland
- Condition of new build should be that infrastructure should be in place before building houses begins, bungalows for older people should be included so families can stay close by this would free up other houses for growing families
- Keep green areas around villages so they remain ad villages
- The bridge under the railway struggles to cope with the traffic on normal days but problems on the A12 can cause queues up to Garden City
- Are the units on the industrial estate in Manningtree fully used or could the space be better used?

- Speed limits are never adhered to this needs urgent attention
- Maps to Small
- Railway crossing needs underpass
- What will happen to my kittens hunting grounds and prey? (from BW aged 7)
- Infrastructure needs attention first plus the railway bridge - do these firsts
- Every new house will have at least 2 cars attached to it. Where is the room for all this extra traffic?
- Can the industrial waste land and derelict/unused units in Manningtree be developed for an indoor swimming pool for use by schools and public?
- The railway underpass needs addressing before more houses are built. Can it be widened and go deeper to allow two-way traffic?
- There are large numbers of existing empty houses' that need to be re-generated before any new houses are built
- Not even one more house should be built in Manningtree, Lawford, Mistley, Bromley etc. area or on north side of river Stour until highway bottleneck at Manningtree railway station is resolved. This should be a national priority and left to local authorities
- Colchester to Elmstead – Infrastructure needed before development e.g. crossings, schools, fibre broadband
- Plans should be bigger –better for seeing what you are planning
- Was any research done into whether local infrastructure could support the disastrously planned housing estate in the middle of arable land on the corner of Heath Road/Rigby Avenue? One dentist practice one doctor's surgery in Manningtree and Roads that are little more than country lanes, not to mention lack of schools. This decision was whooshed through a Tendring Council Meeting, with a faulty sound system, no Chairman. Nobody could hear what was being said and the plan went ahead apparently unopposed. Please tell us exactly how these developments are meant to be sustained. Just plonk them anywhere and hope for the best seems to be the order of the day. We are not "Nimbys" just deeply concerned what is happening to our much loved "countryside and villages
- Parks, footpaths and cycle paths to thread through strategic routes and encourage less car use
- The issue is not the provision of doctor's surgeries but whether the existing surgeries will expand to staff them. Unfortunately, that is not within the gift of the Local Plan but it should be worded so that pressure to provide the staff is able to be applied

- One of the reasons people are moving here and creating a demand for houses is that they can't afford to live in large cities such as London however if this carries on, what are, at the moment villages, will eventually become large over populated and expensive as some of the main cities SW aged 12
- Harwich/Dovercourt Roads, Doctors (never fully operational) doctor's appointment need to be made weeks in advance –then hour wait. Why do we need more houses and people when we can't service the current population? Also dilapidated sites which have become a total eyesore
- A137 station bridge/roundabout problem should have been sorted before building so many houses in Lawford
- Why not a public green space (garden? park?) on old factories site near Manningtree Co-Op (was to have been a Tesco)
- Please take account of existing available sewerage capacity when sanctioning more dwellings houses and flats. At Holland Road, Frinton we regularly suffer raw sewage on our lawns as the local brook overflows when heavy rain occurs
- How about dwelling the A120 at Horsley Cross and building there instead?
- Again bridge under railway has to be an early priority. Aspirations ambitious but based on certain assumptions that may prove wrong. Experience needs to be considered – empty units on Manningtree Commercial site, failure of Clacton Retail Village
- Ardleigh: More doctor's surgeries and more bungalows for Ardleigh residents
- I went to a workshop at a Friends of the Earth Conference about 4-5 years ago first before the Local Plan idea was going to be passed and what we were told was a lot more detailed than what you have put in this exhibition. e.g. people in a village getting together and discussing and planning their particular area. This is all very vague and is like vague vision for what should happen, whereas my understanding years ago was for something a lot more detailed
- Developers are cashing in while pleading poverty when it comes to infrastructure to service new housing
- Farmland should be sold at farmland prices for new homes.... that might then be affordable
- Please if we have to have more housing more imaginative and affordable than the development now going on Cox's Hill - elitist!
- With this massive increase in population in a small community (representing an enormous percentage) Where is our policing? We are already suffering with Mistley Station crossing and being told by officers "well you're insured aren't you?"

- A137 rail crossing needs emphasizing in section 8.21 Transport Network as the A137 is the A12's diversionary route if blocked. We need traffic lights now and commitment to widen the underpass during the term of this Local Plan
- Can the Council please get an idea/plan about how the already cramped local area/people will be effected/squashed before they get bullied into putting 350 more homes on such a small area. GL aged 14
- If these houses are going to be built, the roads will be full and there is no room to expand/add to coincide with the influx. GL aged 14
- If local people are going to be told that houses are going to be built, at least give them an opportunity at court or something of that importance to speak out against it. TDC have not done this because they are too scared of being bullied and sued. GL aged 14
- By doing this you are also bullying local people out of their homes because the views of the community are they don't want to live in such a cramped area -so move. "Good Job" GL aged 14
- By looking at the boards, all views are negative. TDC will you listen to this and do something or will you let yourselves be bullied.....again! Let people vote and you will be able to see the community's thoughts. GL aged 14
- So the best of land (if any) to build on that looks the worst at the moment (Mistley Place Park) gets withdrawn? Come on people, get your act together. GL aged 14
- Why are there no plans of houses to show? If your going to kill our land, at least have the decency to show us the abomination that will replace it!! GL aged 14
- Well done TDC for single handedly killing the local area. GL aged 14
- Do a community vote to gain support for a re-consideration. We live in a democracy but at the moment people are not being listened to. VOTE. GL aged 14
- Sports and Recreation –Provision of safe cycling routes needed in Manningtree/Ardleigh/Bromley /Bradfield areas. Provision of swimming pool in Manningtree area – nearest is 10 miles away with no direct public transport access
- Why isn't there any information about the outline details regarding access, percentages numbers of housing, other units, services etc. for the 300 plus houses off Long Road. Not good enough –completely let down by TDC
- Many new developments seem to be for wealthy people only 4-6 bed properties and not for young people or down sizers. you must address the lack of small properties
- TDC must make the Local Plan sort out Manningtree Station bridge issue e.g. car park on

north side

- Improvements required on A137 at Station we cannot sustain current traffic situation
- Railway Bridge needs an underpass. Commuter parking on roads needs stopping and enforcing (as per Lawford Dale). How can the proposed development be sustained the existing infrastructure and roads?
- Increase every village envelope in the whole district allowing a few dwellings in each village thereby adding to the “life” of Villages and avoiding large scale housing estates
- At present there are virtually no cycle paths in the area. Please address this, particularly when making any improvements to the A137 railway tunnel`
- Speaking to representatives today, I feel sorry, TDC has given no answers that actually answer people’s questions about the import issues
- With all the extra houses in this area plus around Colchester, how is the hospital going to cope with so many extra people? It is already struggling to manage
- It is vital that there are no more housing developments eroding the boundaries between Mistley, Manningtree and Lawford. It is good to see “Strategic Green Gaps” in the TDC Plan but will this stop speculative housing development applications
- This philosophy is fine but there is no reference to the A137 and especially the level crossing bottleneck in Manningtree. What is being done to work with Babergh DC to tackle this. A new car park on the Suffolk side would help the increased commuters
- Need more social and affordable homes. Stop allowing developers to get away with delivering their agreed quotas. Manningtree and surrounding areas are becoming areas for the rich commuters – what about the locals?
- Why are still waiting for the duelling of A120 Colchester to Harwich?
- Long road is already very difficult to cross at certain times. With further 660 families living off Long Road this problem will only get worse
- Housing densities need sorting so that off road parking is promoted. Mistley, Manningtree and Lawford is semi-rural in nature and densities need to reflect this. Only on former industrial estates e.g. Maltings would one expect higher densities
- You need to make LP1 available disabled/ability bungalow development percentage in each Village/town so people can stay with their communities
- One person’s vision is far from the reality of what the people of Manningtree need/want or have asked for! One house becomes a village to a town to a city to over population. The excuse that more houses need to be built. Approved local need for roads with adequate

acres for all

- Demand for so many housing will become unsustainable with major new Network Rail with substantial financial contributions for developers
- Please be aware that Councils and Government are here to serve the people. The general feeling locally is that views are not listened to and everything is already fixed
- Journey time into London via rail from Walton/Frinton and Clacton needs to be improved if you seriously want to attract commuters. My colleague gets into London quicker from Exeter than I do from Frinton
- Green areas between and within villages need to be retained. Much needed agricultural land must be protected to feed future generations. The rural roads are already congested during rush hour times now they will not cope with the amount of future traffic particularly the B1414
- Infrastructure and car parking at Manningtree station are already inadequate Monday – Friday. Wignall Street and Harwich Road Lawford too narrow for existing traffic. Cycling should be promoted but, is dangerous on existing roads
- We have been here 10 years and have been told several times that rail services would improve. One train per hour is insufficient and they need to run later as so the buses so that people can get home from Clacton/London etc.
- May I suggest you visit Canvey Island like us they have one road in/out, or visit other authorities to see what they are offering their rate payers - INFRASTRUCTURE
- Water supply demand? Capacity of sewers?, Sewage treatment , Major infrastructure requests
- The local map is possibly misleading local people as the map does not highlight significant developments not yet built or under appeal e.g. 217 flats at Martello, Walton, 240 at Kirby plus care homes on each site
- I think your looking through rose tinted glasses
- You're not actually interested are you?
- Why is that some of these new estates have no social housing allocations? Giles Watling states you take the money and its a lot
- Moved here from large town and traffic congestion don't want it to follow here. That's why we live here. We need a general hospital now without more houses
- New schools before housing. Better roads, bypass Thorpe. Cheaper rail fares. Doctors before health clinic

- Thorpe-le-Soken roads get gridlocked now
- What about infrastructure for houses?
- Healthy Places? Too many houses, too many cars, too much pollution
- Road in out of Walton Road/Frinton Road nightmare for people already living their traffic flows day and night. No hospital, no social housing for local people already paying for services. Consider local people before holiday makers as we tend to take a back seat when they are in town.
- No infrastructure in place to drains, roads schools, doctors, transport-virtually none existent in the evenings. No lighting, although people still mobile, nurses/carers/police/fire/ambulance/lifeboat who are all serving their community, also people who keep lights in their properties because they do not feel safe. Would this be rectified in the new housing plan.
- I really don't want to look at 240 houses instead of a green field
- I don't agree with building on Station yard car park Walton-on-the Naze
- Housing to meet requirements. How about down-sizing, more bungalows in good areas
- Schools and doctors need to come first not after the houses are built
- Developer should not be allowed to ride rough shod over council plans
- We need the infrastructure schools, roads, dentist, G. P's - not all these new houses
- How do you propose to attract business into Walton town Centre? We need butchers, greengrocers – not another fast food outlet or charity/second hand shop
- Infrastructure before Housing surely?
- Government needs to realise that building houses without infrastructure is a recipe for disaster and this area has virtually reached that point.
- Clacton is rapidly becoming a no go area. Drugs fights more people from London.
- If building surgeries get doctors to put in there. At the moment you can't get appointments.
- Check summer traffic, build shops, surgeries, dentist etc. before houses. Where will people work?
- How many builders are charged the Infrastructure Levy? Like other Local Authorities are doing? Common sense is needed infrastructure before houses, put locals needs first and why is Alresford not having any housing?