Dear Sir/Madam

Please note this planning paper appears to omit fails to specify how to work with Network Rail, Train operating companies, and National Rail Executive in respect of improving rail infrastructure and services for passenger (commuter modal shift, tourism and economic regeneration) and freight (industrial development / freight transfer facilities).

Suffolk County Planners appear to have seized the say for a new rail maintenance depot at Brantham; A missed opportunity for Clacton. We have already made the case how corridors of land around rail routes, stations and roads should be protected from development.

It is NINE YEARS since a fare passenger was killed on a UK train. A record for the UK Europe if not in the world. Rail travel is far safer than road transport and modal shift of commuter traffic, and heavy freight traffic can not only reduce fatalities on the roads via model shift, but also reduce pollution and improve house prices and the economy.

During 2012-13 "ONTRACK" RUA provided substantive input to the draft TDC District Plan. Substantive changes were made and published in respect facilitating improvements to rail passenger and freight infrastructure, services and facilities. Further redrafting of the District Plan and reissue of a fresh draft Plan should we consider include and confirm the policies worked on in the earlier versions which key text is reproduced below:

<<To promote the district's public transport network as a viable alternative to the private car and to facilitate economic growth, trade and inward investment; improve the quality of life for local residents; and improve the experience for visitors to the district, the Council will work with its partners, in particular Network Rail, railway operators and bus operators to:

- encourage increased capacity, frequency of services and service coverage to all stations and bus routes in the district;

- encourage improved facilities for passengers at railway stations, bus stops and greater connectivity with other services and modes of public transport, utilising existing redundant land around stations to deliver comprehensive development packages where practical; and

- explore opportunities to improve or expand the existing rail network (such as reinstating former lines or creating new stations) to meet the needs of the growing population.

- MAJ3.3 reason for change: To indicate the Council's support for proposals aimed at improving public transport services in the Tendring District both for the benefit of residents but also as a means to tackle deprivation and promote economic growth.>>

As you are aware recent regime changes do allow local authorities such as Essex County Council et seq., some flexibility in transport planning and development plans in which the inclusion of desirable objectives and aspirations need not be constrained by public funding budget constraints where it might be reasonable to anticipate private
sector intervention, and funding initiatives. Therefore possibilities opened up by future direct collaboration and partnership co-funding therefore means one can include aspirational objectives dependent on the foregoing.

We think it is important that any land along the rail route corridors or parcels of adjacent undeveloped land or adjacent “brownfield sites” by stations and railway facilities and or former disused rail routes should be protected to enable:

- Future options for insertion of park and ride facilities and/or bus interchange and passenger car parking at many stations
- Future expansion at existing stations such as addition of stabiling sildings or extra or longer platforms, E.g. at Thorpe Le Soken, Walton On The Naze. Many intermediate stations on the Walton On Naze Line, Harwich line and Clacton line will require ultimately longer platforms to accommodate 12 car trains.
- Walton on Naze may become subject of infrastructure expansion by one or the other of the Greater Anglia Franchise Bidders. It has already been mooted that the car park site on former “Station Yard” could be used to provide second platform and stabiling sildings for trains, so more trains can start early mornings from Clacton and Walton The Naze.
- Likewise, reinstatement of second track to Harwich Town and stabiling silding facilities
- Future addition of double tracking/ connecting curves E.g. A long dynamic double track loop section on Walton On Naze Line say between Frinton and Kirby Cross and beyond, if not full double tracking, is one option for example that would solve the single track bottlenecks and delays on the Walton Line.
- Future insertion of freight stabiling sildings and transfer facilities.
- Expansion of freight rail/road transfer facilities (vastly underdeveloped in the UK compared to Europe and Americas, especially in respect of Inter Modal Traffic).
- This should envisage future rail freight growth taking over longer distance freight as the supply of HGV Drivers becomes more limited by retirements, high HGV Training Costs etc., requiring intermodal (i.e. Containerised Freight) freight handling / transfer facilities being required in key port and industrial areas in addition to existing bulk aggregate, fuel oil and heavy equipment/motor vehicle transport at Harwich International or Harwich Town, and ultimately even again at Mistley / Manningtree Quay or River Colne Quay areas
- New stations at Gorse Lane Gr. Clacton and Essex University Campus Wivenhoe to provide “Park & Ride” and/ or access to rail transport for newly populous centres not directly served by a local rail station.
- Potential re-openings of closed stations and lines such as the line to Brightlingsea (option of an alternative route Reopening/ Re-Instating of closed stations to facilitate park and ride traffic from housing developments at outlying mid-Tendring villages.

Yours Faithfully
John Smock
Hon Chair “ONTRACK” RUA

From: consult@objective.co.uk [mailto:consult@objective.co.uk]
Sent: 05 August 2016 16:47
To: 
Subject: Tendring District Local Plan Part 1 - North Essex Strategic Plan

Dear Stakeholder,

Following onto the email which was sent this afternoon, the documents for the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment Consultation will be accessible on the Tendring District Council Website via HTTP://TENDRING-CONSULT.OBJECTION.CO.UK

Alternatively, the documents will be available in the libraries across Tendring from Wednesday 10th August.
If you have any further questions, please let the planning policy team know via email: planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk or 01255 686177

Kind Regards

Planning Policy

No virus found in this message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 2016.0.7690 / Virus Database: 4627/12749 - Release Date: 08/05/16
Hi Tina

I think this is the right email address for Ian. If not Paul will pass it on I am sure!
Ian/Paul - my comments went to Planning Policy by email as I think your registration system must have crashed this pm.

Regards,
Tim

Cllr Tim Young

Sent from my iPad

On 8 Sep 2016, at 17:01, "Tina Bourne" <tinajanebourne@gmail.com> wrote:

OMG!

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Tina Bourne
Date: 8 September 2016 at 16:59:51 BST
To: ian.davidson@tendring.gov.uk
Subject: Local plan consultation

I am very concerned to see Tendring placing so much of its housing development on the borders of my County Council Division. I wish to retain the green wedge between Colchester and Tendring. It is completely unfair for Tendring to take the CIL revenue of such a large Garden Community Development on land on the East of Colchester when there will be such a large impact on Colchester. I am particularly keen to see a 1.5 km gap between Greenstead and Longridge and the new development site and that salary brook local nature reserve should be created into a Countrypark similar in size to Highwoods Countrypark. I wish to see any development be a catalyst for infrastructure improvements including a new link rd from the A120 and A133. if the development proceeds real passenger focused bus provision providing fast high quality responsibly priced buses should be a priority. Health and Education should be expanded to meet the needs of this development. Current school and health priority for existing residents in Greenstead and Wivenhoe should be retained. I support the Universities plans for the expansion of the knowledge gateway to ensure more employment opportunities are created which will be good for Colchester and Tendring.

Message from:
Councillor Tina Bourne
Portfolio Holder for Housing & Public Protection
Colchester Borough Council

Sent from my iPhone
Tina Bourne

The information in this email, and any attachments to it, is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). If you should not have received it you must not take any action based upon it, or forward, copy or show it to anyone; please tell the sender you have received the email in error, then permanently delete it and any attachments. Any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Colchester Borough Council and/or Colchester Borough Homes. Although the Council has taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses are present in this email, the Council cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of this email or attachments.

Tim Young
colnehousing.co.uk

This email (including any attachments) is intended only for the recipient(s) named above. It may contain confidential or privileged information and should not be read, copied or otherwise used by any other person unless express permission is given. If you are not a named recipient, please contact the sender and delete the email from your system. It is the recipient's responsibility to ensure that appropriate measures are in place to check for software viruses.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit http://www.symanteccloud.com

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit http://www.symanteccloud.com
By Planning Services

North Essex Strategic Plan

and

Tendring District Local Plan

Preferred Options Consultation

REPRESENTATION FORM

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Please use this form for sending comments to the Council on the Tendring District and North Essex Strategic Plan consultation documents, preferably using the on-line form on our website: tendring-consult.objective.co.uk or send by e-mail to planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk.

Please send your representation form to arrive by 5 pm on Thursday 8 September 2016 to:

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

For further information, please see our web page at www.tendringdc.gov.uk or email: planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk alternatively telephone: 01255 686177, 01255 686188 or 01255 686151 to talk to one of the Planning Policy Team.

Please note that any information supplied to the Council on this form cannot be kept confidential. Copies of all responses will be available for inspection at the Council Offices and may be included in a summary schedule of responses to be made available at public libraries and on the Council’s website. The Council will enter responses on a computer database, to be used by the Council for the purpose of recording and collating comments and for contacting people and organisations about their responses. Your name, town and comments will be published.

Please complete your details and those of your agent, if applicable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: *Mrs Sue Jiggens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode: [redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation: Member of Weeley Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: [redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: [redacted]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Required information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent’s Name: (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent’s address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thursday 8th September 2016

Dear Sir

TENDRING DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN – PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION

Before I move on to my Representation, there are some observations/comments I would like to make on the process.

A. **On submitting Representations to the Council**, I believe that you have not made it clear to respondents how you will accept representations. As you will see below, Options 1 and 3 appear to preclude a simple letter. However, as Option 2 clearly states that you are happy to accept comments in the form of a letter, that is what I have chosen to do. Notwithstanding your preference, I trust that my letter and its points will be included in your summary of representations.

1. **REPRESENTATION FORM states:**

   **IMPORTANT NOTICE**

   Please use this form for sending comments to the Council on the Tendring District and North Essex Strategic Plan consultation documents, preferably using the on-line form on our website: tendring-consult.objective.co.uk or send by e-mail to planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk.

2. Your website states:

   A representation form can be downloaded to assist people making comments, but we are happy to accept comments in the form of a letter or e-mail.

3. **The Preferred Options Consultation Document states:**

   You can send us your comments of support, or objection, in a number of ways:
   - In preference, to aid the collation of your comments – through the Council’s website www.tendringdc.gov.uk
   - In the form of an e-mail; or
   - By the use of the standard comment form that is available at the ‘deposit points’ where this document is available for public view.

B. **On accessibility to TENDRING DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN – PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION:**
You have invited the public to submit their comments on the Plan. They could view the Plan using one of the following:

1. Exhibitions
2. A local library
3. On line
4. By purchasing a copy

The population of Tendring is disproportionately elderly. It should come as no surprise to anyone then, that in simple terms, the general population is less likely to be able to access any of the options above than say for example, a younger demographic in a high employment, planning officers or indeed council members.

On the options to view:

1. Exhibitions: Under any conceivable circumstances it would be impossible for anyone to absorb sufficient information from attending an ‘exhibition’ let alone from the meagre information available, to form a reasoned and informed response. At the exhibition in the Council Chamber, Weeley on 3rd August, there was a dismal paucity of meaningful and understandable information available to view and a lack of identifiable staff to assist. Apparently they were busy downstairs.

2. A local library: Again, a visit to a local library, not easy for everyone, would not provide the requisite conditions for studying and understanding the 236 pages of this document.

3. On line: As you will know, and unsurprisingly, not everyone has access to the internet and fewer still have a working knowledge of navigating the intricacies of the Tendring District Council website. It is not easy for those accustomed to studying multiple page documents on line. The average household is not equipped to deal with your ‘preferred’ method of accessing and responding to a document of this size and complexity.

4. By purchasing a copy: The nub. It is unlikely that Jo Public is in a position to spend £75 on their own copy of the document so that they can study all 236 pages at their own convenience, enabling them to at least attempt a meaningful response.

One could be forgiven for thinking that reasoned and informed responses from the public are not encouraged.

I have no doubt that you have met the minimum requirements for Consultation, but complicating access to the document and the methods of representation, and tying respondents up in planning-speak and bureaucracy is not inclusive access.

B. On completion of the Representation Form

I understand that responses using the Representation Form, understandably from your point of view your preferred option, will be collated into some kind of summary that will show how many people ticked Support, Object or Vary. Simple. I do wonder if, in the absence of supporting Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation, these therefore unsubstantiated ‘votes’ will be taken into account?

I have no doubt that the professionals who deal with these forms on a regular basis and who have the benefit of impressive qualifications in their fields, will have no difficulty completing the form to your satisfaction. The form has been designed by professionals, to be completed by professionals.
Jo Public has, I know, been totally confounded by the demands of the completion of the form. I have been following the Local Plan, have attended and spoken at meetings, have written letters – with the research necessary, but this form has left me bewildered. Aside from the fact that an individual would have had to have read and understood all 236 pages (see accessiblity above), the enormous task of going through every point, point by point, picking out and explaining their Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation to satisfy your Representation Form, is beyond the majority of the residents of Tendring. This is obvious. I know that many people have submitted duplicate letters, written by people with a better (but probably not adequate) understanding of the situation and I believe that in your Consultation Process, you give less weight to these submissions, if you include their content in any way at all except by publishing them on your website. I suspect that letters, with no completed tick boxes will not even feature in your summary. This is wholly unfair and not in any way transparent. It is wholly unfair to expect ordinary citizens to fully understand this process and respond in the terms that you demand. This process is not inclusive.

**REPRESENTATION**

I have chosen to present my Representation in two parts, the first professional planning advice, the second, my observations of some of the reasons why this Plan is unsound.

**Part 1. Professional Planning Advice**

- **PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION DOCUMENT**

I have taken professional planning advice on the contents of the Preferred Options document, and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.

In terms of Government policy, as expressed in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) and accompanying procedural guidance, the advice that I have received is that the document is fundamentally flawed, and as currently drafted would fail to meet the necessary tests of soundness to enable the Plan to be recommended by a Planning Inspector for adoption.

The emerging Local Plan is neither Positively Prepared, nor Justified, nor Effective, nor Consistent with national policy. In other words, it would fail to satisfy any of the tests of soundness for a Local Plan. I comment in more detail below.

Firstly, in terms of being Positively Prepared, the emerging Plan is not being prepared on the basis of a strategy “which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements ....consistent with achieving sustainable development” (NPPF para. 182). The key point here is that it sets out a strategy and accompanying policies which do not demonstrate that it will achieve sustainable development. It is a strategy which would deliver a pattern of unsustainable development.

Secondly, in terms of being Justified, the document does not contain “the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives...” (NPPF paragraph 182). Reasonable alternatives to the strategy that is now put forward in the document have not been considered or tested, and this is most evident in the context of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) process. Furthermore, when considered against reasonable alternatives, the preferred Spatial Strategy is not the most justifiable option in terms of delivering sustainable development, either in the context of the Plan’s evidence base or a robust Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process. Specifically, the SA process is itself flawed, and the preferred strategy has been selected before the SA appraisal has been fully undertaken. In other words, the SA process has not informed the selection of the Preferred Options strategy, but has been
undertaken pursuant to decisions already taken by the Council as a means of seeking to justify those decisions. The repeated publication of SA documents by the Council after relevant Committee and Council meetings, and after the commencement of public consultations is evidence that the process is not being undertaken in accordance with best practice on development plan preparation.

Thirdly, in terms of being Effective, the document does not demonstrate with the necessary levels of certainty that it will be “deliverable over its period” (NPPF paragraph 182).

Finally, in terms of being Consistent with national policy, the document and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal fail to demonstrate with the necessary level of certainty that it “...will enable the delivery of sustainable development”, as also noted above.

The Preferred Options document is also internally inconsistent. It sets out a draft strategic Policy (SP1) in Part 1 with a presumption in favour of sustainable development, together with other strategic policies promoting sustainable patterns of development. Draft Policy SP6 states that “new development will be focused on the principal settlements in each district. Below this level, each local authority will identify a hierarchy of settlements where new development will be accommodated according to the role of the settlement, sustainability, its physical capacity and local needs”.

The Spatial Strategy, as set out at pages 64-71, completely fails to adhere to these strategic policy principles, and in a number of cases runs directly counter to those principles. The Spatial Strategy fails to promote sustainable patterns of development. This stems from a fundamental failing of Policy in terms of “Managing Growth” as expressed in draft Policy SPL1, which sets out a proposed settlement hierarchy. Firstly, the drafting of the Policy is itself defective and requires significant amendment to constitute a robust planning policy. Secondly, under any objective assessment of the factors necessary to demonstrate that the proposed Settlement Hierarchy is an appropriate measure to determine the locations for potential sustainable future development, it is clear that the hierarchy is based on flawed assessments.

This is most evident within the category of ‘Rural Service Centres’, but is also found within the category of ‘Smaller Rural Settlements’. By way of examples from each category, the level of service provision, such as public transport, retail facilities, education and health, is significantly higher at Thorpe-le-Soken than at Alresford or Little Clacton. Similarly, the level of service provision at Great Oakley and Ardleigh is higher than at Little Bentley or Tendring.

The Preferred Options document therefore fails to address the key principles of Policies SP1 and SP6 in a number of respects, but crucially has failed “to identify a hierarchy of settlements where new development will be accommodated according to the role of the settlement, sustainability, its physical capacity and local needs”. Indeed, these key principles have quite simply been ignored in a number of instances with regard to the planned distribution of Housing and Employment growth within the district.

This then leads to the position regarding Weeley, and analysis of Policy LP1 (Housing Supply). In terms of delivering an uplift in housing supply from 550 homes per annum to 600 homes per annum, the only settlement where the uplift will occur is Weeley (from 304 dwellings to 1,411 dwellings). There will be no uplift at higher order settlements, and we have the quite bizarre situation where there is no uplift at demonstrably more sustainable settlements such as Harwich & Dovercourt, Frinton, Walton & Kirby and Manningtree, Lawford & Mistley. Nothing in the Council’s Evidence Base supports this position, and in due course at a future Examination I will demonstrate in full how the Evidence Base, and a robust Sustainability Appraisal, would lead to a different pattern of Housing distribution.
The advice that I have received is that the Council will not be able to demonstrate to a Planning Inspector that the housing distribution described in the preceding paragraph constitutes a sustainable pattern of development. Furthermore, there is no evidence to suggest that the uplift proposed at Weeleys has been tested against other possible alternatives – for example a more balanced distribution of the additional 1,207 dwellings (i.e. the uplift from 550 to 600 dwellings p.a.) across the district, or at different settlements.

Under any objective analysis of the key sustainability criteria of settlements across the district (e.g. health care and educational provision, public transport accessibility, retail provision, open space provision), the proposed expansion of Weeleys is not justifiable in planning terms.

It is my belief that within this Representation I have demonstrated that the proposed Spatial Strategy and accompanying distribution of Housing and Employment allocations as set out in the Preferred Options document is based upon a series of flawed assumptions, which are not supported by the necessary evidence or a robust Sustainability Appraisal process.

Should the Plan proceed to Regulation 19 stage without significant amendments, and specifically without a substantial reduction to the proposed Housing growth at Weeleys, then I will present evidence at the forthcoming Examination to amplify the above points and demonstrate the failure of the Plan to meet the necessary tests of soundness, and its failure to promote sustainable development. I shall request that the Inspector finds the Plan to be Unsound, or that it be Withdrawn.

I shall also address failings of the Council under the Duty to Co-operate and other procedural requirements at an Examination, but they are not matters for now.

I formally OBJECT to the Preferred Options document for the reasons set out in this Representation. I request that this Duly Made Representation is reported in full to the relevant Council Committees, and should I find that the Representation is summarised or edited in any way in the agendas to those meetings, I will ensure that all Councillors receive a full copy of my representation in advance of the meeting, if necessary with a supplementary note highlighting any inaccuracies in report.

Part 2: My observations of some of the reasons why this Plan is unsound.

This is not a Consultation and never has been. At least not any definition of the word of which I am aware. It has been The Council imposing its will, going through the motions of following statutory processes. There is no planning justification for ignoring reasonable alternatives to those presented. The previous ‘Consultation’ Issues and Options Consultation Document September 2015 was a sham. I attach my comments letter to the Council on this Consultation at Appendix 1.

When I spoke at the meeting on 9th June 2016, I said:

- Presented to this Committee on 14th July 2015 - 11 months ago - your hypothetical Positive Vision for Tendring in 20.32 - said – The New Developments at Weeleys Garden Village will have taken place. Nothing has changed.

- At this Committee meeting on 11th April, Cllr Guglielmi said:
  ‘We should not worry about figures and statistics, not get hung up on data. We should just get it through’
  We are not just talking about random statistics, even though they are random. We are talking about sustainable justification for what you are planning to do.

- On the Hierarchy of Settlements: on which your new housing distribution is based.
This has been demonstrated to be in part, a work of fiction. We have told you this. You have ignored us. Your persistent portrayal of your alternative reality is very worrying. It is beyond comprehension that you continue to use this seriously flawed document as the basis for all that follows. We have to hope and trust that this will be picked up by the Planning Inspector.

- **On the recent Consultation:**
  If we had more confidence in the council’s willingness to properly evaluate the information gathered through the recent consultation, we wouldn’t need to highlight this issue.

The submissions during the Public Consultation.

Appendix B: Consultation Undertaken, is divided into four sections.

1. **Technical Stakeholders**, who said: Option 1: Hartley Gardens Suburb and Option 4: Higher Urban Densities were the most sustainable. Option 2: Weeley Garden Village was only sustainable in ECC’s view if secondary school travel was by train. Option 3: Tendring Central Garden Village was not sustainable.

   OK, so you choose to ignore that.

2. Then came, **Landowners and Developers**, who said very little of note except that:

   “There had also been two representations from developers and landowners promoting large, mixed use development in support of Option 2: Weeley Garden Village”.

   Of course they did. Their plans for Weeley’s future have nothing to do with sustainability or the enhancement of the village. They stand to make millions out of this. This is not the Council planning for the future of the district and its residents. — It is landowners planning for their own future.

   OK, so you give this plenty of weight.

3. Thirdly, came **Community Representatives**, who predictably defended their own back yards. And who can blame them.

4. Then, at last, last, came the voice of **The Public**. This document has DISTILLED all this effort — well over 1,000 pages, into 12 lines of text.

   Included, is a derisory two-line distillation on Option 2, which reads:

   The general consensus was that the only advantage for Option 2: Weeley Garden Village was in respect of transport infrastructure, including the railway.

   Let’s not forget that Thorpe-Le-Soken, that you claim does not have a railway station — runs hourly through trains to London and half hourly to Colchester. Weeley has a paltry 2 trains a day to London Monday to Friday, limited service on Saturdays and no trains at all on Sundays. **How have you got this so wrong?**

   I question that this consultation had any purpose at all.

**On The Settlement Hierarchy**

The Settlement Hierarchy - this declaration of ‘facts’ is THE document that has informed the proposed distribution of housing in Tendring. Incidentally, I note will considerable alarm that the detail of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy April 2016 is notable by its absence from the TENDRING
DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN – PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION. It is summarised in a couple of pages. Surely, this should have been included? Or, maybe the Council would prefer to keep the ‘mistakes’ from the public domain?

Unsurprisingly, and for obvious reasons, this document - The Settlement Hierarchy, is the basis of legitimate contention. Nobody wants massive development in their back yard. However, the words Fair and Proportionate have not even been considered. Neither has attention to detail and fact. It is unforgivable that the Council had proceeded with this document in the full knowledge that it is seriously flawed.

There cannot be anyone in the Council – Members and Officers, who now do not know that these figures are at best clerical errors, at worst, I don’t know. They are shockingly inconsistent and flawed. This has been clearly stated by Councillors and the public at Council Planning Meetings. And yet no-one has done anything to investigate and correct them. You push ahead, regardless.

At the Planning Committee meeting on 11th April 2016, Clr Guglielmi said: ‘We should not worry about figures and statistics, not get hung up on data. We should just get it through’

How can this be?

TENDRING DISTRICT COUNCIL
Planning Department
Local Plan
Settlement Hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Primary School</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>Defined village centre</th>
<th>Defined employment area</th>
<th>Railway Station</th>
<th>Good bus route</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airesford</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Bentley</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe-le-Soken</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is blatantly inaccurate. See the Facts, below:

CORRECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Primary School</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>Defined village centre</th>
<th>Defined employment area</th>
<th>Railway Station</th>
<th>Good bus route</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Amended Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airesford</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Bentley</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe-le-Soken</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For demonstration purposes only: while I do not argue that Great Bentley has a good bus service, because it doesn’t, I would say that while ‘good’ bus route has been a criterion here, the same has not been applied to ‘Railway Station’.

THORPE-LE-SOKEN DOES HAVE A RAILWAY STATION, with a GOOD service. By anyone’s interpretation this is a fact. Another fact is that is that many villagers including those from Weeley, Great Bentley, Weeley HEATH, Little Clacton, use Thorpe-le-Soken railway station because the service from Thorpe-le-Soken is, in terms of the rest of the network in Tendring, very good, while Weeley is appalling.

Weeley has a railway station with a POOR, in fact appalling service. See ③ above. Therefore, in applying similar criteria to that applied to bus routes, it does not have a ‘good’ railway service. Therefore, it does not have a Railway Station.

④ When questioned at a Planning Meeting, where the (imagined) boundary between Weeley and Weeley Heath lies, the Planning Manager replied that it is the railway line. So Weeley Heath HAS a Primary School. In reality, of course it has a Primary school regardless of railway lines. Weeley does not have a Primary School or a railway station — but I will not justify that meaningless assertion with a comment. Weeley Heath’s railway station, in applying similar criteria to that applied to bus routes, does not have a ‘good’ railway service. Therefore, it does not have a Railway Station.

As you will see, applying reality to these charts completely changes the Hierarchy. Why have Tendring District Council refused to acknowledge and address this travesty?

Interestingly, the public transport distance measurements for routes, take the centre of the village/settlement as the starting point for distances to/from services. Perversely, the Council uses the settlement boundary for measuring distances to/from bus and railway provision. This makes no sense.

Evidence of train and bus destinations/frequencies/Journey times is freely available on the relevant public transport web sites.

On ‘THE UPLIFT’: @ Policy LP 1

Having established the Housing Supply @ 550 homes/year, Weeley’s contribution to/share of the housing supply is designated as 304 new homes – approximately 3% of the total, which is entirely reasonable in the context of Tendring’s need for new housing. This figure is supported by sound and justifiable planning reasons.

The Uplift @ 600 homes per year, on the other hand, sees nil increase to ALL of Tendring except Weeley. Here we see 1411 new homes – an approximate increase of 13%. Where are the sound and justifiable planning reasons?

There are none.

How can the Council justify a momentous turnaround using the same ‘sound planning’? It cannot. Tendring is attempting to solve its Uplift dilemma by dumping it on Weeley. On many levels, beyond my capabilities to explain, this is wrong.
In summary,

Unfortunately, Weeley has an excess of famers who don't want to farm anymore and a scarcity of influential individuals. Those with the biggest personalities, strongly parochial tendencies and sheer doggedness exert their influence over those who are, shall we say, more sensitive to the needs of others. In terms of Localism, fairness and proportionality, this is so terribly wrong. Weeley doesn't have a powerful parish council or councillors with the ability to commit to a sustained campaign to see that fairness is done.

Even though we have tried by all means available to us to counter the inconsistencies and plead for fairness, the residents of Weeley and indeed Tendring Village, should not be penalised, if fact dumped upon, because we do not have the wherewithal to stand up against the big boys.

Yours faithfully

Sue Jiggins (Mrs)

Attachments

Appendix 1 Copy of my submitted response to Tendring District Council Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation Document September 2015
12th October, 2015

The Planning Policy Manager
Planning Department
Tendring District Council
Council Offices
Thorpe Road
Weeley
Clacton-on-Sea
Essex
CO16 9AJ

Dear Sir

TENDRING DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN – ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION

As you may recall, I have previously voiced my Objections earlier this year to the emerging Issues and Options Consultation at meetings of the Council’s Local Plan Committee. I now write to formally submit my Objections to the consultation document.

Before I do that, I would like to make some general observations about the process.

Numbers

We were led to believe that the ‘requirement’ for new homes was around 12,000. Then it became 10,000. Now it is reported in the press and by some Councillors that it could be as low as 8,000. What is unclear is whether these figures are Government-led or TDC-led. The Government maintains that the figure should take into account local needs which presumably the Council are more aware of, but TDC blames the Government.

The Consultation Document assumes a number of new homes that has yet to be clarified/finalised, but puts forward Options 1-4 for 800 homes, which should the total requirement, be less that 12,000 will not be needed. So you are pitting communities against each other in their fight to not have The Option in their area, potentially for nothing. Or is this more around keeping local landowners and/or developers happy?

The Consultation Document is not clear. You are asking people to have a view on something that is uncertain. Or, maybe, if the people of an Option do not make a fuss, that Option will be adopted in preference to another area (not in Options) where the voters are more outspoken or have a Councillor with more to say?
Format of the Tendring District Local Plan, Issues and Options Consultation Document

I find it difficult to understand how the Council can honestly believe that this document is truly a consultation document. Each issue from 1-4 opens with a question that can only have one answer!

- **Issue 1 Jobs**
  Do you agree that creating the conditions for economic growth and creating new jobs should be a top priority for the Local Plan?

- **Issue 2 Homes**
  Do you agree that we need to plan for the right number of homes, of the right size, type and tenure to be built and in the right locations for current and future generations?

- **Issue 3 Infrastructure**
  Do you agree that the Local Plan will be critical for making sure we have the right infrastructure in Tendring to accommodate the new jobs and homes we will need in the future?

- **Issue 4 The Environment**
  Do you agree that protecting and enhancing the environment is an important issue for this Local Plan?

How and/or why would anyone disagree with any of these points? However, a sweeping agreement to these sweeping statements does not mean that a 'Yes' automatically infers an agreement to *how it is achieved!*

Whereas,

- **Issue 5 Setting out a vision for the future**
  Do you agree with the vision for the future of Tendring set out above?

The general public are not adequately equipped to respond to this question in the terms that qualified Town Planners would accept as relevant objections.

We can all put in our two penny's worth defending our own backyards, but there has to be a sensible overview of what is fair and proportionate to all.

Will the Council read and take into account all the responses that go further than a yes or a no? Or will the responses be reduced to a line of text?

The Council's treatment of public views.

One has to assume that the Council believes that a contribution from members of the public has 'worth' and even added value, and that this is why the public are invited and allowed to contribute to council meetings:
"PUBLIC SPEAKING The Chairman informed the public speakers, who had recorded their wish to speak at the meeting, that they would be invited to speak for three minutes at the start of the specific item on the agenda they had requested to speak on."

In belief of this worth, members of the public work very hard and under stressful conditions - we are not on the whole public speakers, to refine and condense what we believe to be relevant, important and informative points that will be acceptable to the council.

It is therefore surprising and distressing that our efforts are so diminished in the only documented record of those points, the minutes of those meetings.

A definition of 'Minutes' arguably could be:
An accurate record of the debate and discussion that preceded the decision.

For future reference, and this reference could be for many reasons, the minutes are the only record of who said what at the meeting. In my experience the minutes do not record what was said. My three minute speeches were reduced to a few words. My speech was not recorded. It was as though I had not said anything.

Appendix 1 (For future reference)
Presentation to Local Plan Committee Meeting 27th November 2014
Was recorded as:

"Mrs Susan Jiggins spoke against the proposal for 1,100 homes in Weeley, referred to the strength of public opinion against the proposal and expressed concern that the Draft Local Plan was being led by developers and not by the Council or the public."

Appendix 2 (For future reference)
Presentation to Local Plan Committee 14th July 2015
Was recorded as:

"Mrs Sue Jiggens, a local resident, spoke against the proposed Weeley Garden Village development."

I provide detailed responses to certain of your consultation Questions below.

However, it is a fundamental aspect of this response that my Objections are not structured according to your Consultation questions, and therefore unlikely to be recorded individually and comprehensively. My response is focussed principally upon the impacts of the Consultation proposals upon Weeley – a settlement which is not addressed by any specific question within your document, but which is affected to a very great extent by Option 2 within your Options for Growth.

I therefore now focus upon Option 2, as you have presented it.

Firstly, it is clear from the document that your initial proposal for a "Weeley Garden Village" of 800 homes by 2032 will be the first phase of a development that could expand by a further 2,000 homes up to 2047 – a further 130 homes per annum between 2032 and 2047. The concept is based upon the premise that you can make Weeley sustainable (c.f. para. 8.16 of your document). It is implicit – and of course true – that Weeley is not a sustainable location at the present time. The village has
two shops and one public house, a primary school at capacity, an hourly rail service to Clacton and Colchester (but no service at all on Sundays) and bus services to Clacton, Colchester and Manningtree. The railway station is amongst the least used in Britain, let alone Essex and Tendring.

Quite simply, to achieve a sustainable development will require so much investment in infrastructure, that it will not be viable for a development of 800 homes (up to 2032) – under your current S.106 Agreement arrangements, or under the Community Infrastructure Levy should your Council at some point introduce it. At best, the development of 800 homes may secure a new and/or expanded Primary School and little else. It will not deliver any new Primary Health Care facilities in Weeley, no new shops, no additional bus services and no enhancements to the railway service. This is simply evident from other new developments elsewhere in Essex, and many of those are in areas where development values are much higher than in Tendring.

Under any definition of good planning, it is ludicrous to consider that Weeley can be viewed now, or in the future, as “sustainable”. It is a small village which just happens to be on the A133 and on the railway line between Colchester and Clacton. It does not have the necessary key baseline sustainability criteria to suggest otherwise.

I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to Option 2, which is imposing a level of proposed new housing upon Weeley that is out of all proportion to the infrastructure capacity of the village, is neither fair nor proportionate - and the Council will not be able to deliver the necessary new infrastructure.

Yours faithfully

Sue Jiggens

Attachments:

Appendix 1
Appendix 2
Section 1 – Do you Support, Object or wish to Vary any policies or parts?

Please tick the boxes below to indicate whether you support, object to, or would like to vary, any part(s) of the North Essex Strategic Plan (Part 1 Plan) and Tendring District’s Local Plan Preferred Options (Part 2 Local Plan) consultation documents. You may tick as many or as few boxes as you wish.

If you object to, or would like to vary, any part of the document please give your reasons in the boxes provided after each chapter and make clear which part/s of the plan the comments relate to.

You may continue on a separate sheet of paper if necessary.

You may comment on any other issues in Section 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part(s) / Policy Reference of the document</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART 1 PLAN: NORTH ESSEX STRATEGIC PLAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision for the Strategic Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP2: Meeting Housing Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP3: Providing for Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP4: Infrastructure and Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP5: Place Shaping Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP6: Spatial Strategic for North Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP7: Development and Delivery of New Garden Communities in North Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP8: East Colchester/West Tendring New Garden Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP9: West of Colchester/East Braintree New Garden Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP10: West of Braintree New Garden Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PART 2 PLAN: TENDRING DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PREFERRED OPTIONS

### SUSTAINABLE PLACES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy SPL1: Managing Growth</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy SPL2: Settlement Development Boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SPL3: Sustainable Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VISION & OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 2 Local Plan: Vision for Tendring</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 Local Plan: Objectives For the Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ALTHY PLACES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy HP1: Improving Health and Wellbeing</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP2: Community Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP3: Green Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP4: Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### LIVING PLACES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy LP</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP1</td>
<td>Housing Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP2</td>
<td>Housing Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP3</td>
<td>Housing Density and Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP4</td>
<td>Housing Layout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP5</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP6</td>
<td>Rural Exception Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP7</td>
<td>Self-Build Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP8</td>
<td>Backland Residential Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP9</td>
<td>Traveller Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP10</td>
<td>Care and Assisted Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP11</td>
<td>Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) &amp; Bedsits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROSPEROUS PLACES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy PP</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP1</td>
<td>New Retail Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP2</td>
<td>Retail Hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP3</td>
<td>Village and Neighbourhood Centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP4</td>
<td>Local Impact Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP5</td>
<td>Town Centre Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP6</td>
<td>Employment Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP7</td>
<td>Employment Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP8</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP9</td>
<td>Hotels and Guesthouses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTED PLACES</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Vary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CP1: Sustainable Transport and Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CP2: Improving The Transport Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CP3: Improving The Telecommunications Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICIES MAPS</th>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part(s) / Policy Reference of the document</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A – Glossary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B – Consultation Undertaken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C – Local Maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D – Local Wildlife Sites and Ancient Woodland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E – Heritage Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2 – Any other comments
If you have any other comments, please give further details below, indicating which part of the document you are commenting on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---Please see attached letter---

Date: 08/09/2016

Signature:

Thank you for your comments.

The Council will consider all responses before preparing its Submission Development Plan Document.
Hello.
I represent the Frinton Residents Association (FRA) and the attachment is our response to the above.
You may wish to note that we were part of a working party set up by the Frinton & Walton Town Council to determine the Town’s response and the attachment embraces the Town councillors and FRA comments.
The Town has sent the same response under separate cover and I have decided that registering our response with the same detail is appropriate due to the amount of input we gave, and the unity we have in our considerations.
Best regards,
Alan Eldret
Representing the Frinton Residents’ Association
Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation

The response from the Town Council of Frinton and Walton
to Tendring District Council - August 2016

These comments are primarily about the policies and show our agreement to them (marked Support) or suggested changes (marked Vary or Object). We have also included some suggested changes to the explanatory pre-ambles. All these comments are in the same order as the TDC issued document.

Part 1: North Essex Authorities

SP1 - Support
SP2 - Vary

We believe this could be overstating Housing needs For a Plan of 17 years therefore the following paragraph should be added.

"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."

SP3 - Support
SP4 - Vary

We believe the plan period for all three Districts should be 2016 - 2033 as shown in SP3.
The seventh bullet point should have "and expanded settlements." After the words Urban areas.
Reason
So more areas can benefit from this Policy.
SP5 - Vary
Take "where appropriate" out at the end of 1st Paragraph and finish the paragraph as "... design codes for large and strategic scale developments"
Reason:
To improve the quality of future development.
SP6 - Vary
In second paragraph, second line, replace words "to avoid" with "there is no"
Reason
Makes the Policy stronger.
SP7 - Support
SP8 - Support
SP9 - Support
SP10 - Support

Delivery Arrangements - Support
Part2: Tendring

2 Sustainable places
SPL1 - Vary
Reason: If Weeley is to be an expanded settlement.
Recognition of the state, size and suitability of the B1033 must be addressed eastwards.

SPL2 - Support

SPL3 - Vary
Part B, point a) add following words after “Highway Network”. “as existing before the development”

3 Vision and Objectives

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 ....”

3.2: Objectives for the plan Support all ten objectives.

4 Healthy Places

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.

HP2 - Support
HP3 - Vary add at end of first paragraph: “which includes green gaps and green wedges.”
Reason: To strengthen the Policy.

HP4 - Support

5 Living Places:

LP1 - Support
LP2 - Support 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” “That all large developments must have highways, raised curbs and footpaths built to a standard that can be adopted by the Essex County Council.”

Insert new item g) 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.

LP4 - Support 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.

LP8 - Support LP9 - Support LP10 - Vary Create two new use classes (It can be done!) These classes 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.

LP11 - Support.

6 Prosperous Places:

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!

PP2 - Support

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. ....”

PP4 - Support

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.

**PP8 - Support**

**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 un-hindered. We cannot straight jacket businesses. If we do, the professional small Hoteliers will go elsewhere. Large Hoteliers will still develop, produce mediocore 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 the 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”.
PPL2 - Support

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.

PPL4 - Support
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.

PPL9 - Support
PPL10 - Support
PPL11 - Support

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.

PPL13 - Support
PPL14 - Support
PPL15 - Support

8 Connected Places
CP1 - support
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"

CP3 - Support.

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.
Naomi Hart

From: Tim Young
Sent: 08 September 2016 16:06
To: Planning,policy
Cc: 
Subject: Local Plan Consultation

Dear TDC

Your system is taking an age to register me and, as the deadline is approaching, I wanted to make sure you received my comments as Ward Councillor for Greenstead ward in Colchester:

I am very concerned to see Tendring placing so much of its housing development on the borders of my Colchester Borough Council ward. I wish to retain the green wedge between Colchester and Tendring. It is completely unfair for Tendring to take the CIL revenue of such a large Garden Community Development on land on the East of Colchester when there will be such a large impact on Colchester. I am particularly keen to see a 1.5 km gap between Greenslead/Longridge and the new development site and that Salary Brook local nature reserve should be created into a Country Park similar in size to Highwoods Country Park. I wish to see any development be a catalyst for infrastructure improvements including a new link road between the A120 and A133. If the development proceeds then real passenger-focused bus provision providing fast, high quality, affordably priced buses should be a priority. Health and Education should be expanded to meet the needs of this development. Current school and health priority for existing residents in Greenstead should be retained or improved. I support the University's plans for the expansion of the Knowledge Gateway to ensure more employment opportunities are created which will be good for Colchester and Tendring.

Regards,

Tim

Cllr Tim Young
(Greenstead Ward)
Deputy Leader of the Council
Portfolio Holder for Culture & Regeneration
Leader of the Labour Group
Colchester Borough Council

The information in this email, and any attachments to it, is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). If you should not have received it you must not take any action based upon it, or forward, copy or show it to anyone; please tell the sender you have received the email in error, then permanently delete it and any attachments. Any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Colchester Borough Council and/or Colchester Borough Homes. Although the Council has taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses are present in this email, the Council cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of this email or attachments.
Response attached from Great Bromley Parish Council to the Local Plan.

Kind regards

Lizzie

From: Parish Clerk [mailto:clerk@greatbromley.org.uk]
Sent: 07 September 2016 18:09
To: Elizabeth Ridout
Subject: Fwd: TDC local plan submission

Kind regards

Lizzie Ridout

Parish Clerk
Great Bromley

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Hugh Frostick"  [redacted]
Date: 6 September 2016 at 09:51:57 BST
To: "GBPC Councillors & Clerk" <council@greatbromley.org.uk>
Subject: RE: TDC local plan submission

Hi All,

Here is what I have. I welcome comments.
Not sure if it goes as a letter like this or online from submission, will look later.
Will submit tomorrow afternoon.

Hugh
Hugh,

Have you finished your submission yet, I would like to see it please before you send it in

Regards

Fred
Great Bromley Parish Council

Chairman - Kate Strowbridge

Great Bromley Parish Council's Response to the
Tendring District Local Plan -
Preferred Options Consultation Document 2013-2033 and beyond.

3rd September 2016

Great Bromley Parish Council considers that the latest draft plan provides a pragmatic solution to meet the sustainable housing demands of the district within the plan period. This latest iteration of the plan is comprehensive and logical and we believe it well addresses all the relevant issues.

The residents of Great Bromley were particularly grateful for the exhibition provided last year at Great Bromley Village Hall which gave them an overview of the proposed strategic development options and the opportunity to comment on them. Many also took the opportunity to view one of the recent exhibitions of this latest iteration of the plan. These sessions were well presented and confirmed that the many comments submitted locally, regarding in particular the unsustainable development proposal in the Great Bromley/Little Bentley/Frating area, had been taken into consideration.

We have no comments to make, other than a couple of minor proof-reading points that have been noted:

- Policy LP2 (p7) missing T in 'The' in first line.
- 1.5.1 (p23) we assume Map 2 should read Map 3.

We look forward to rapid production of the final draft of the new District Local Plan and its subsequent scrutiny and approval by the government inspector. We believe the plan should be taken forward to adoption as soon as possible to prevent further undesirable development in the district being approved in the absence of a current, authorised local plan.
Dear sir/madam

Please find attached Elmstead Parish Council’s response to the above consultation. Please confirm receipt of this representation.

Kind regards

---

Angela Baxter
Clerk to Elmstead Parish Council
Telephone: [Redacted]
Elmstead Parish Council’s response to the above consultation:

First of all our concerns regarding the proposed Colchester East/Tendring West Garden Development are as follows (ref page 43 policy SP 8 and para C8 map 12):

- We are very unhappy with the eroding of the green gap between Colchester and Elmstead Market, which is currently a stand-alone village with a rural ambience, despite its proximity to Colchester. This level of new development so close to the village will affect the rural character and appearance of Elmstead to an unacceptable extent, and is therefore inappropriate to the locality. The loss of open spaces and habitat is an ongoing concern for the people of the village and the Elmstead fringe, being an issue which is raised whenever building developments within and around the village are proposed, together with the effect on the appearance and beauty of the local countryside.

- We are also concerned about the access to Colchester via the A133, as this is already regularly severely congested beyond the B1028 junction, and not just at peak times. Despite any alternative modes of transport/new major links which may be built as part of the development, there is certainly going to be an increase in traffic along this route. (ref p74 – Colchester fringe para 3.1)

We also have other concerns which we would like to see addressed before the next consultation, which we understand will take place before the Local Plan is finalised.

- We would like to see the exhibition improved so that it is easier for people to identify their own area, and see exactly what is proposed i.e. clearer plans more widely spaced and with multiple plans on view for the specific area of the exhibition. It would also be helpful if more TDC personnel could be on hand to help the public.

- Whilst we understand that the proposed Garden Developments are currently very much in outline only, it would be helpful to residents, both in the village and in the outlying area, to be given some idea of the timeline for developments – i.e. how many dwellings are proposed to be built where and when. The same comments apply to business developments – are any “business parks” envisaged? The current lack of any detail at all is extremely worrying for residents.

- We are currently experiencing increased traffic flows through Elmstead Market, and this is only going to worsen with all the proposed new building throughout Tendring, leading to more pollution and noise. We would like to see plans for road improvements to mitigate this.
Attached is a response from the Wivenhoe Society to Part One of the Tendring District Council’s preferred options consultation. This focuses mainly on the proposed East Colchester/West Tendring garden community which would have a considerable impact on Wivenhoe.

Contact details
The Wivenhoe Society

Regards
Jane Black
From The Wivenhoe Society

Comments on Tendring District Council’s preferred options Part 1

In the following the paragraph numbers and the policies are referenced but some issues arise in several sections.

The main comments we wish to make are:

1. In the overall targets for the Housing Market Area (Chelmsford, Colchester, Tendring and Braintree the overall housing target for Colchester seems to be based on trend predictions and it is questionable whether continuing the previous high rate of growth for Colchester is sustainable within this overall target. Possibly Chelmsford should share more of the HMA overall allocation.

2. The proposed East Colchester/West Tendring garden settlement will have very severe traffic impacts for the already heavily congested A133 and no concrete measures are proposed to mitigate this nor seem to us to be feasible.

3. We query whether no alternative could be found for this suggested garden settlement which did not involve using agricultural land graded as excellent.

The Need for a Strategic Approach, 1.3.1 to 1.3.4
The Society accepts that a strategic housing approach looking at the North Essex region as a whole is a sensible one. It is unfortunate that Maldon has not participated. The Housing Market Area (HMA) consisting of Colchester, Braintree, Tendring and Chelmsford is analysed in the “Objectively Assess Housing Need Study” but Chelmsford is only tangentially mentioned in the Strategic Part 1 of the document. See more on this point in comments on Meeting the Need for new Homes, 1.10.1 – 1.10.8

Meeting the Need for New Homes, 1.10.1-1.10.8, SP2 Meeting Housing Needs
The Society recognises that the Country as a whole needs more new houses but the Objectively Assessed Housing Needs Study and the Demographic Forecasts for the strategic area all seem to be based on the assumption that past trends in net inward migration will continue in the HMA at the same level as in the past, with various degrees of sophistication in the assumptions made. A Strategic Plan should be proactive and consider what is desirable and sustainable and not simply rely on past trends.

It could be appropriate for some parts of the HMA to grow faster and some at a slower rate than in the recent past. Colchester has been one of the fastest growing areas in the UK owing to the availability of suitable development sites in the last decade or so. This is one of the factors that have driven inward migration. It could be argued that inward migration has been housing supply led rather than demand led. The question should be asked whether it is sustainable for this trend to continue indefinitely given the constraints on the road infrastructure, particularly in Central
Colchester, and the fact that future development will have to be on green field sites.

**SP2** The table in this policy shows the proposed number of dwellings for the constituent parts of the HMA with the exception of Chelmsford. The Brett report suggests 775 as the annual build rate for Chelmsford and this is consistent with the figures given in the text. Using the 2011 census figures for the housing stock a base comparison the figures given show the following annual percentage increase on the 2011 stock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual build</th>
<th>% Increase on 2011 stock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braintree</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is proposed that Braintree should grow at much faster rate than previously but building rates there have been relatively low in the past. Chelmsford is of a comparable size to Colchester but the proposed rate of increase is lower despite the fact that house prices are higher in Chelmsford (indicating a demand for housing there), that it is thought likely that employment will grow faster than elsewhere in the HMA and that it is closer to London.

Colchester is assigned the largest per annum target and this understates the actual figure as some of the housing proposed for the East Colchester/West Tendring garden settlement will effectively be part of Greater Colchester. Colchester has also grown fast since 2011 so if this growth is included the increase on the 2011 stock would be even greater. The annual build rate proposed of 920 for Colchester is requiring Colchester to take more than its proportionate share of overall government housing targets. This target should be reduced to recognise that Colchester has already provided more housing, proportionately, than other areas in the country and in the region. The growth proposed for Tendring shows a defeatist attitude about the potential for employment growth in the area.

It would be helpful if the proposed growth rates were compared to targets for England and the UK as a whole.

**Infrastructure and Connectivity**

**Para 1.17.1** This paragraph and policy **SP4** mention the A133. The residents of Wivenhoe are concerned about the current levels of congestion on this route on Clingoe Hill and routes westwards from the Greenstead roundabout (used to access Colchester and the strategic road network). The policy talks of improved road infrastructure to reduce congestion and to provide more reliable journey times. No details are given as to how this might be achieved for the A133. Given the built up nature of the town to the east of Colne Causeway it is difficult to think of any feasible solution to the problem of peak hour traffic as no space for new roads or major road
intersection improvements. The issue of greater use of public transport is discussed below in the section on the East Colchester/West Tendring Garden Settlement.

Cross Boundary Garden Communities: Para 1.24.1 onwards

The Wivenhoe Society does not object to the concept of garden communities as such. There are advantages from forward planning for the long term for necessary infrastructure. However traditionally new garden cities were developed by growing an existing small settlement. This has the advantage that there are some existing facilities to serve the initial stages of development before enough housing has been built to support additional infrastructure. This would seem to be the case for the suggested development based around Marks Tey but would not be the case for the East Colchester/West Tendring proposed garden community.

The Wivenhoe Society has several concerns about this eastern garden settlement on the Colchester Tendring border.

SP8: East Colchester/West Tendring New Garden Community
The land concerned lies mainly in Tendring but the new development would effectively be an expansion of Colchester with residents looking to Colchester for all but very local services. The proposals for the plan period up to 2033 provide for 2,500 homes to be built in this location and the longer term suggestion is for 7,000 to 9,000 dwellings or even 11,000 for one of the possible options. The potential developers, in discussions with the Wivenhoe Neighbourhood Plan group, spoke of developing the site north of the A133 at a rate of about 300 houses a year. There is no existing infrastructure on the site and in the early years the suggested build rate would not provide a sufficient base for the provision of new local infrastructure, including public transport, and it would take a long time for it to develop into a viable semi self-sufficient community. Some discussion and explanation of transitional arrangements is required particularly with regard to school place provision.

SP8, D Transportation
A major concern is the adequacy of the road network. The A133 is already subject to severe congestion at peak times. It is the only route for cars into Colchester from Wivenhoe given that Boundary Road is a through route only for buses. Greenstead roundabout is a pinch point. It only takes one accident for severe problems to arise. When it had to be closed recently for road markings to be replaced, the official diversion involved a distance of 23 kilometres (there was a shorter but nonetheless lengthy diversion for those with local knowledge). The unpredictability of journey times means that for crucial appointments a safety margin for possible delays has to be allowed when planning trips. The congestion on the A133 and frequent hold-ups is a problem not only for Wivenhoe residents but all those who have to use Clingoe Hill and the Greenstead roundabout, including those travelling from Tendring. Building 2,500 homes feeding on to this route will cause severe problems and it is difficult to see how a potential settlement of up to 9,000 dwellings is feasible. A
route connecting the A133 to the A120 could provide some alleviation. This is not specifically included in the proposals in SP8 though access off the A120 is mentioned. An A120 link is shown in the Tendring Preferred Options document. **Such a link would not help with increased vehicle demand for those wishing to travel to Colchester.**

**Section D of SP8** speaks of measures to mitigate the transport impacts and of longer term transport interventions. Without any concrete proposals this would seem to be an empty promise. **We urge both Colchester Borough and Tendring to explain what mitigation measures could be put in place given the physical constraints.** The section also talks of the development of a public rapid transit system and some red lines are shown on the map for East Colchester. It is difficult to see that there is any possible route into central Colchester to the west of Colne Causeway that could deliver a reliable service with predictable journey times. **Without detailed proposals this would also seem to represent wishful thinking and some concrete and feasible proposals need to be included.**

Even if a rapid transit system could be developed it is not clear that this would be sufficient to deal with traffic issues. Firstly Central Colchester is not necessarily the desired destination, particularly for journeys to work. Secondly it is uncertain how many people would use the system. Wivenhoe has a frequent and relatively fast bus service to central Colchester (as part of the route uses Boundary Road). It also has a railway station with direct trains to London. However the 2011 census figures showed that 61.9% of journeys to work were by car/van and only 7.1% by bus. **There is no reason to believe that residents of the proposed settlement would be more likely to use public transport than those in Wivenhoe.**

One of the merits of the garden settlement concept is that it allows forward planning for infrastructure and amenities and for provision to take place at an early stage. **There is a real danger that if the first phase of 2,500 dwellings are built it will then be found that it is not possible to mitigate the traffic impact on the A133 and that the suggested post-2033 additional development is not feasible.**

**SP8 C: Employment**

SP8,5 Provision of land for expansion of the Knowledge Gateway is supported on the site towards the south and would be supported even if the garden settlement does not go ahead.

SP8,6. It is not made clear whether there will be a link to the A120 for the businesses suggested for the north of the site.

**SP8 E: Community Infrastructure**

SP8,13, 14 the provision of health facilities and schools is welcomed but the residents of Wivenhoe are concerned about the timing of such provision and whether there will be adverse impacts on facilities in Wivenhoe in the early years of the development before a critical mass of housing is built.
SP8, 15 The provision of a country park is welcomed.
SP8, 16 Some indoor leisure facilities should be provided on the site. Contributions
towards sports facilities at Broad Lane Sports Ground managed by the Wivenhoe &
District Sporting Facilities Trust, as proposed in the Wivenhoe Neighbourhood Plan,
would be welcomed, especially for a new Sports and Recreation Hall.

SP8 F: Other Requirements
SP8, 18, 19, 20 and 21 are all proposals to be supported if the site is developed.

General comment on the sustainability of the East Colchester/West Tendring
new garden community

The NPPF lays stress on sustainability. The Preferred Options document does not
directly refer to the common Sustainability Appraisal for Part I. Sustainability
objective 2 in this latter document is labelled "impacts" which covers Acceptable
impacts on high quality agricultural land, important landscape features, townscape
features, sites of nature conservation interest and heritage assets. *It would seem
more usual for the impact on agricultural land to be a separately assessed.* Almost
all of the land proposed for the new community is rated as excellent by Natural
England. There is only a limited area of "excellent" land in the region and this is
concentrated mainly just to the east of Colchester. The Sustainability Appraisal gives
an amber rating for objective 2 but this is only because the impact on agricultural
land is masked by the assessments for the other impacts - landscape features etc.
This is rather like hiding the rotten cherries at the bottom of the punnet.

If a garden settlement to the east of Colchester is necessary then the Wivenhoe
Society urges Tendring and Colchester to reconsider its suggested location. An
obvious possibility is for Weeley to be expanded. Weeley has a railway station and
with a larger settlement, it would be feasible for more of the through trains to London
to stop there. There is a link to the A120 quite close to Weeley. Less money would
need to be spent on trying to provide transport fixes. The land is of lower agricultural
value than that immediately to the east of Colchester and in terms of impact on the
landscape, heritage, wild life sites etc the impact would be no greater and possibly
lower. A pro-active approach to attracting employment would be necessary. The
future for high value employment is in knowledge based industries. It should be
pointed out that Weeley is as close to the University of Essex as the Cambridge
Science Park is to downtown Cambridge. *A development at Weeley could also be
expected to help the economy of Clacton, particularly with respect to services and
retailing.*

A second strategy would be to put the suggested East Colchester/West Tendring on
hold until 2033. This would have the advantage that experience in developing garden
settlements would be gained in the meantime though it is difficult to see how the road
access issue could ever be satisfactorily resolved.
If Colchester persists with its proposals to build 920 dwellings a year the total of 1,250 dwellings as part of this overall total currently allocated for the East Colchester settlement would need to be relocated. Our suggestion would be that the Marks Tey Garden settlement should be developed at a faster rate which would allow the infrastructure to support the new development to be put in place at an earlier date. To compensate for the loss of potential dwellings on the East Colchester/West Tendring site site, Tendring could up its allocation for Weeley (more than one scenario for Weeley is discussed in the Tendring Preferred Options) and possibly expand some of the other settlements served by the rail line. To counter a possible charge of NIMBYISM the primary concern of Wivenhoe residents is the impact of the suggested garden settlement on the A133. *If there were any feasible ways of improving/not worsening journey times and reliability for travel to Colchester then Wivenhoe residents would be much less opposed to the proposal.* They would regret the loss of the attractive green countryside to the north of the A133, would have some concerns about the impact on facilities in Wivenhoe in the early years and would question the wisdom of using agricultural land graded excellent. However they would possibly, even if reluctantly, accept that the country needs more houses and that the proposals for a country park and landscape buffers would offset some of the impact on neighbouring communities. *The impact on the road network is however the great stumbling block.*
Tendring Planning,

Please find attached Little Oakley Parish Council’s response to the North Essex Strategic Plan and the Tendring District Council Local Plan Preferred Options consultation.

Please can you acknowledge receipt of this response by return email.

Kind regards

Vikki Howard
Clerk to Little Oakley Parish Council
Email: vikki@littleoakley.info
Phone: [redacted]
Web: www.littleoakley.info
North Essex Strategic Plan
and
Tendring District Local Plan

Preferred Options Consultation

REPRESENTATION FORM

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Please use this form for sending comments to the Council on the Tendring District and North Essex Strategic Plan consultation documents, preferably using the on-line form on our website: tendring-consult.objective.co.uk or send by e-mail to planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk.

Please send your representation form to arrive by 5 pm on Thursday 8 September 2016 to:

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

For further information, please see our web page at www.tendringdc.gov.uk or email: planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk alternatively telephone: 01255 686177, 01255 686188 or 01255 686151 to talk to one of the Planning Policy Team.

Please note that any information supplied to the Council on this form cannot be kept confidential. Copies of all responses will be available for inspection at the Council Offices and may be included in a summary schedule of responses to be made available at public libraries and on the Council’s website. The Council will enter responses on a computer database, to be used by the Council for the purpose of recording and collating comments and for contacting people and organisations about their responses. Your name, town and comments will be published.

Please complete your details and those of your agent, if applicable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Vikki Howard</th>
<th>Agent's Name: (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:*</td>
<td>Agent's address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Oakley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode:</td>
<td>Postcode:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation: Little Oakley Parish Council</td>
<td>Telephone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vikki@littleoakley.info">vikki@littleoakley.info</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Required information*
Section 1 – Do you Support, Object or wish to Vary any policies or parts?

Please tick the boxes below to indicate whether you support, object to, or would like to vary, any part(s) of the North Essex Strategic Plan (Part 1 Plan) and Tendring District’s Local Plan Preferred Options (Part 2 Local Plan) consultation documents. You may tick as many or as few boxes as you wish.

If you object to, or would like to vary, any part of the document please give your reasons in the boxes provided after each chapter and make clear which part/s of the plan the comments relate to.

You may continue on a separate sheet of paper if necessary.

You may comment on any other issues in Section 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part(s) / Policy Reference of the document</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART 1 PLAN: NORTH ESSEX STRATEGIC PLAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision for the Strategic Area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP2: Meeting Housing Needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP3: Providing for Employment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP4: Infrastructure and Connectivity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP5: Place Shaping Principles</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP6: Spatial Strategic for North Essex</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP7: Development and Delivery of New Garden Communities in North Essex</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP8: East Colchester/West Tendring New Garden Community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP9: West of Colchester/East Braintree New Garden Community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SP10: West of Braintree New Garden Community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Arrangements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP4</td>
<td>Infrastructure is a main concern for all. Bus services throughout the district are getting worse. It is getting increasingly difficult to get buses to where you want to go because the bus companies keep cutting the bus services. This needs to be looked at to see what improvements can be made and how.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP5</td>
<td>There needs to be adequate parking spaces supplied for each development. One or two parking spaces per house is often not enough and thought should be given in how to accommodate more parking spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PART 2 PLAN: TENDRING DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PREFERRED OPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUSTAINABLE PLACES</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy SPL1: Managing Growth</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SPL2: Settlement Development Boundaries</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SPL3: Sustainable Design</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Oakley Parish Council welcome the inclusion of Little Oakley as a Smaller Rural Area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION &amp; OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 Local Plan: Vision for Tendring</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 Local Plan: Objectives For the Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 Local Plan Vision for Tendring and Part 2 Local Plan Objectives for the local plan</td>
<td>Little Oakley Parish Council feels that building lots of houses will not bring employment into the area, especially Harwich. With Harwich being a port town, Tendring District Council needs to be proactive and go and look at how successful port towns are operating/run rather than leaving things to 'just happen'. Little Oakley Parish Council also think that the overall plan is good, but can't see that this will ever happen the way it is set out. The words 'Dream on' were mentioned when discussing the document.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEALTHY PLACES</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP1: Improving Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of document</td>
<td>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP1</td>
<td>Little Oakley Parish Council do support HP1, but feel that this will be hard to achieve, especially at Clacton and Harwich hospitals. These two hospitals need to be FULLY utilised and pressure needs to be applied to the relevant bodies to make sure this happens. There are not enough health services in Clacton and Harwich hospitals and when more houses are built this is going to make the problems we have already a lot worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIVING PLACES</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP1: Housing Supply</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP2: Housing Choice</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP3: Housing Density and Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP4: Housing Layout</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP5: Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP6: Rural Exception Sites</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP7: Self-Build Homes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP8: Backland Residential Development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP9: Traveller Sites</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP10: Care and Assisted Living</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP11: Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) &amp; Bedsits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP3 and LP4</td>
<td>While Little Oakley Parish Council support LP3 we feel that the density for the houses are too dense. You need to be practical when deciding on parking for the houses built and make sure there is enough parking spaces for tradesman when they come to do work at someone's house and for visitors. We often see cars parked on the side of the road blocking access to emergency vehicles because there is nowhere suitable to park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP5</td>
<td>Little Oakley Parish Council feel that affordable housing should be for local people and that conditions should be placed on affordable housing, especially in rural areas, that mean that they cannot be sold for profit and can only be sold on to local people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROSPEROUS PLACES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP1: New Retail Development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP2: Retail Hierarchy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP3: Village and Neighbourhood Centres</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP4: Local Impact Threshold</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP5: Town Centre Uses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP6: Employment Sites</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP7: Employment Allocations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP8: Tourism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP9: Hotels and Guesthouses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP10: Holiday Parks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP11: Camping and Caravanning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP12: Improving Education and Skills</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP13: The Rural Economy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP14: Priority Areas for Regeneration</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation

- **PP6**: PP6 needs to be robustly applied.
- **PP7**: Little Oakley Parish Council feels that building lots of houses will not bring employment into the area, especially Harwich. With Harwich being a port town, Tendring District Council needs to be proactive and go and look at how successful port towns are operating/run rather than leaving things to 'just happen'.
- **PP8**: Marina in Harwich would encourage and enhance tourism in Harwich.

### PROTECTED PLACES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPL1: Development and Flood Risk</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL2: Coastal Protection Belt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL3: The Rural Landscape</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL4: Biodiversity and Geodiversity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL5: Water Conservation, Drainage and Sewerage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL6: Strategic Gaps</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL7: Archaeology</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL8: Conservation Areas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL9: Listed Buildings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL10: Enabling Development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL11: Renewable Energy Generation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of document</td>
<td>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL1, PPL2, PPL3</td>
<td>Wholeheartedly Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And PPL4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL5</td>
<td>Not enough existing drainage and sewerage as it is at the moment in Dovercourt and Little Oakley. Water does not drain away. Existing drains cannot support a lot of new houses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL6</td>
<td>Wholeheartedly Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL10</td>
<td>This is fine in principle. It should be applied in a way that reflects the spirit of the paragraph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL11</td>
<td>There were mixed views on this. Build houses with Solar Panels on roofs, rather than big solar farms was a suggestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONNECTED PLACES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy CP1: Sustainable Transport and Accessibility</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy CP2: Improving The Transport Network</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CP3: Improving The Telecommunications Network</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICIES MAPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>A four way junction at Great Bromley A133/A120 would be welcomed if it could be done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part(s) / Policy Reference of the document**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part(s) / Policy Reference of the document</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Infrastructure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Review</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A – Glossary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B – Consultation Undertaken</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C – Local Maps</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D – Local Wildlife Sites and Ancient Woodland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E – Heritage Assets</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of document</td>
<td>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2 – Any other comments
If you have any other comments, please give further details below, indicating which part of the document you are commenting on.

Little Oakley Parish Council feel that on the whole, on paper the plan looks good, although in reality most of it will not happen the way it is written. The ideas are good, but pressure needs to be applied on the proper bodies to get health, education and infrastructure in place to support the new housing. Parking is also an issue. When people have tradesmen to their houses, deliveries or visitors e.g. health visitors, district nurses etc, there is not enough places to park and these vehicles block the roads because of this. This needs to be a factor in the designing of new developments.

Little Oakley Parish Council welcome the inclusion of Little Oakley being classified as a Smaller Rural Settlement.

Date: 5th September 2016
Signature: Vikki Howard – Clerk to Little Oakley Parish Council
Thank you for your comments.

The Council will consider all responses before preparing its Submission Development Plan Document.