

## CHAPTER 12: POLICIES MAPS

This section also deals with some third-party site-specific development proposals (see also comments in relation to Appendix B – Local Maps).

### Chapter 12: Policies – General comments on the Local Plan maps and site specific proposals for non-defined settlements

ID	Rep ID	Name. Organisation	Legally compliant	Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan	Council response	Contact details
<b>Representations from Technical Stakeholders</b>															
None received.															
<b>Representations from Community Representatives</b>															
1022144	LPPuD189	The Harwich Society	Y	Y	N	X	X	X	X	H	N	The mapping falls short of the standard required for accuracy and clarity and does not provide a sound basis for the statutory planning or participation by users or communities. The printed mapping is lamentable for the towns, such as Harwich (map B15). There are no printed policy maps whatsoever as part of the Local Plan Publication Draft for West, South East and North East Tendring. The printed mapping towns and villages fail to record Conservation Areas. The printed maps fail to record other key planning constraints such as SSSI's. Conversely the printed mapping includes Sand and Gravel deposits even though the Local Plan contains no policies relating to such features being a County Matter. The printed map insets for villages, fail to indicate key policies which appear on the North East Tendring on-line map. The on-line mapping whilst it is possible to view all policy maps at a larger scale on line, the policy boundaries can become blurred.	Rectify the policies and local maps to address the identified problems because policy mapping needs to be an effective foundation for the future statutory planning process.	The Council acknowledges that the quality of the mapping in the Local Plan could be improved to ensure it can be better understood in the context of the policies that apply to different areas. A more detailed response is set out below. It is suggested that these matters can be addressed when the Council comes to publish the final adopted version of the Local Plan.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.
1106169	LPPuD430	Gibbon Farms (c/o Peter Le Grys – Stanfords)			N	X	X	X		W	N	The Council has failed to recognise that Aingers Green is a settlement in its own right, with a public house, shop and bus services. The area is also within a short walking distance to Great Bentley railway station. Land west of Aingers Green is directly adjacent to the village settlement boundary as shown in earlier versions of the draft plan. By allowing development, an appropriate and reasonable level of development could be provided to help sustain and improve local services without affecting the rural character of the area. Vehicular access to the site would meet the County Council visibility splays while the development would not necessitate the removal of any trees or hedgerow.	Amend settlement development boundary to include land west of Aingers Green.	Aingers Green is not included in Policy SPL1 as a defined settlement as it has limited access to jobs, shops, services and facilities compared to other larger villages. More explanation is set out in relation to Policy SPL1, the Local Plan identifies sufficient land to meet objectively assessed housing needs and no changes to the policies map to include the objector's land within a settlement development boundary are required.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.
1106169	LPPuD431	Mr. Richardson (c/o Peter Le Grys – Stanfords)			N	X	X	X		H	N	Tendring Green has been accepted on appeal as a sustainable village. The land directly opposite the site (rear of the Fat Goose) was approved on appeal earlier this year for 5 dwellings as being a sustainable development. The settlement is able to accept further development that would be socially and environmentally appropriate. The site a long established haulage yard and B2 commercial garage. The removal of a non-conforming commercial use and by implication the redevelopment of a brownfield site will improve the character of the area and amenities for local residents. By allowing development of this site, an appropriate and reasonable level of development could be provided to help sustain and improve local services without affecting the rural character of the area. The site is within walking distance of local services and will enable the removal of the existing commercial buildings thereby improving the character and appearance of the site which adjoins the open countryside to the south. Vehicular access to the site can be achieved to meet the County Council visibility splays and this arrangement has been agreed in discussions with that authority. The development would not necessitate the removal of any trees or hedgerow.	Amend settlement development boundary to include land rear of the Fat Goose, Tendring.	The cluster or development in question is not included in Policy SPL1 as a defined settlement as it has limited access to jobs, shops, services and facilities compared to other larger villages. More explanation is set out in relation to Policy SPL1, the Local Plan identifies sufficient land to meet objectively assessed housing needs and no changes to the policies map to include the objector's land within a settlement development boundary are required. Nearby planning permissions would have been granted with specific reasons for departing from the Local Plan, such as a housing land shortfall at that time.  On the land at and around the former Fat Goose pub, further applications were granted for 3 dwellings (17/02142/FUL) and 2 dwellings on appeal (17/01091/FUL). Application 18/01093/OUT for 5 dwellings was however refused by the Council and dismissed on appeal.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.
1106169	LPPuD433	Mr. A. Black (c/o Peter Le Grys – Stanfords)			N	X	X	X		W	N	Land at Pilcox Hall Lane, Tendring Heath should be included in the Local Plan. Tendring Heath has been accepted on appeal as a sustainable village. The land directly adjacent to the site was approved earlier this year for 5 dwellings as being a sustainable development. The settlement is able to accept	Amend settlement development boundary to include land at Pilcox Hall Lane, Tendring Heath.	Tendring Heath is not included in Policy SPL1 as a defined settlement as it has limited access to jobs, shops, services and facilities compared to other larger villages. More explanation is set out in relation to Policy SPL1, the Local Plan identifies sufficient	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.

Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond; Publication Draft – Schedules of representations and responses – Chapter 12: Policies Maps

												further development that would be socially and environmentally appropriate. By allowing development of this site, an appropriate and reasonable level of development could be provided to help sustain and improve local services without affecting the rural character of the area. The site is within walking distance of local services. Vehicular access to the site can be achieved to meet the County Council visibility splays and this arrangement has been agreed in discussions with that authority. The development would not necessitate the removal of any trees or hedgerow.		land to meet objectively assessed housing needs and no changes to the policies map to include the objector's land within a settlement development boundary are required. Application 18/00007/OUT for 3 dwellings on this land was refused by the Council in February 2018 and later dismissed on appeal. Nearby planning permissions would have been granted with specific reasons for departing from the Local Plan, such as a housing land shortfall at the time.	
1106169	LPPuD432	Fairley & Sons (Farms) (c/o Peter Le Grys – Stanfords)			N	X	X	X		W	N	Land at Wolves Hall Lane, Tendring should be included in the Local Plan. Tendring Heath has been accepted on appeal as a sustainable village. The land directly adjacent the site was approved earlier this year for 5 dwellings as being a sustainable development. The settlement is able to accept further development that would be socially and environmentally appropriate. By allowing development of this site, an appropriate and reasonable level of development could be provided to help sustain and improve local services without affecting the rural character of the area. The site is within walking distance of local services. Vehicular access to the site can be achieved to meet the County Council visibility splays and this arrangement has been agreed in discussions with that authority. The development would not necessitate the removal of any trees or hedgerow.	Amend settlement development boundary to include land at Wolves Lane, Tendring Green.	Tendring Green is not included in Policy SPL1 as a defined settlement as it has limited access to jobs, shops, services and facilities compared to other larger villages. More explanation is set out in relation to Policy SPL1, the Local Plan identifies sufficient land to meet objectively assessed housing needs and no changes to the policies map to include the objector's land within a settlement development boundary are required. Nearby planning permissions would have been granted with specific reasons for departing from the Local Plan, such as a housing land shortfall. Application 17/00600/OUT for 5 dwellings was refused in June 2017 and subsequently dismissed on appeal.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.
1021465	LPPuD18	EPC-UK (c/o Rebecca Booth - Leith Planning Ltd)	Y	Y	N	?	?	?	?	N	N	Policy PPL15 fails to include the safeguarding plan for Bramble Island, Great Oakley onto the main Proposals Map, we suggest the plan to be amended to correlate with the draft policy, given the need to protect the site from unsuitable development and encroachment.	Include the safeguarding plan for Bramble Island, Great Oakley onto the main Proposals Map.	No objection to the Policies Map being corrected to include the safeguarding area, as requested.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.
<b>Representations from Community Representatives</b>															
None received.															
<b>Representations from Members of the Public</b>															
1007034	LPPuD115	Kevin Marsden	N	N	N	X		X	X	H	N	I have strong concerns in regard to the proposed 'reduced' format of the draft document in particular the very poor standard of the inset plans. All previous LP's have had a large area plan and a series of 'one-off' detailed local plans in which ALL relevant zones and boundaries are clearly marked. The new document is almost unusable as a visual-aid for those of us who have to present issues for discussion at committee meetings. It is of particular concern that plans do not now indicate the Built Environment Conservation Zones (Purple Outlined) which leaves the user in the position of having to consult other documentation. It is our view that the emerging plan should be a ONE-STOP-SHOP for ease of use and should contain ALL the relevant information needed by users in order to make informed comment. At this stage and after all the expense that has been incurred it is not good enough to cut corners in order to make relatively small savings on publication costs.	Ensure the maps show all of the relevant information in a clear manner.	The Council acknowledges that the quality of the mapping in the Local Plan could be improved to ensure it can be better understood in the context of the policies that apply to different areas. A more detailed response is set out below. It is suggested that these matters can be addressed when the Council comes to publish the final adopted version of the Local Plan.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.

Four of the above representations relate to sites being promoted for inclusion in settlement development boundaries in settlements that are not currently listed in the settlement hierarchy of Policy SPL1 and are not currently defined by such boundaries. The justification for not including small hamlets and settlements like Aingers Green, Tendring Green and Tendring Heath in the is explained in relation to Policy SPL1 and relates to their limited accessibility to jobs, shops, services and facilities compared with other larger villages. It is acknowledged that planning permission has been granted for some development in those areas as departures from the Local Plan, but it is not considered necessary to amend the policies maps or local maps to reflect these.

The representations from the Harwich Society and Mr. Marsden raise concerns about the quality and legibility of the mapping accompanying the publication draft. We note that Ramsey & Parkeston Parish Council and Wrabness Parish Council and some other respondents raise similar concerns. It is the Council's view that the Policies Maps and corresponding Local Maps are clear enough to indicate the designations that will apply to different areas of land, but it is acknowledged that they could be made clearer and that there are some errors and inconsistencies that ought to be corrected before the Local Plan is adopted. There is also some debate as to whether the Local Maps (which only show the designations imposed by the Council such as the settlement boundaries and protected open spaces) should show the full range of designations shown on the district wide policies maps. The Council is happy to take the Inspector's advice on this matter and will amend the Local Plan if necessary before it is adopted. Where amendments to Local Maps (Appendix B) are being suggested by the Council, it has shown a 'before and after' map which demonstrates the potential quality of mapping that could be achieved, if necessary.

On modification to the main policies map is suggested in response to the comments of EPC-UK to show the safeguarding area around Bramble Island.

**Suggested modification:** Amend the main Policies Map to show the safeguarded area around Bramble Island to which Policy PPL15 relates, as advised by EPC-UK – see diagram below.

