Dear Sir

Please find attached my comments relating to the Preferred Options Consultation Document.

Regards

Peter Dumsday
Chairman Weley Parish Council
Little Oakley Parish Council
Mrs Vikki Howard, 3 Rectory Road, Little Oakley, Harwich Essex. CO12 5JX

6th September 2016

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

Dear Sirs,

Please find enclosed 3 completed comment forms for the North Essex Strategic Plan and Tendring District Local Plan, Preferred Option Consultation 2016, as handed to me, Vikki Howard, Clerk to Little Oakley Parish Council.

There is one from Mr Harold Griffiths, one from Miss Val Wyncraft and one from Tracy Churchwood.

I would be grateful if you could email me to confirm receipt of these forms.

Yours Faithfully

[Redacted]
Vikki Howard
Clerk to Little Oakley Parish Council

Received On
- 8 SEP 2016
By Planning Services

Telephone: [Redacted]  
Email: vikki@littleoakley.info
Name: * Walter Waycraft
Address: * Little Oakley
Postcode:
Organisation (if applicable)
Telephone: 
Email: 

Comments:

Very pleased indeed that Little Oakley will still be classed as a village. Great news!! Very very concerned about infrastructure, roads, sewers, hospitals, G.P. surgeries, dentists. Things cannot cope at the moment let alone more development. This is a very serious concern of mine.
Successful consultation must be shown to be meaningful in order for the local plan to be adopted. It would therefore be expected that all relevant contributions would be taken on board. The consultation must not be used to hinder the process or stifle debate, but should be an integral part of it. The consultation process should be open, fair, and accessible to all those who wish to participate. It is the responsibility of the council to ensure that the consultation is conducted in a way that is transparent and accountable. The consultation document should be clear, concise, and easy to understand. It should be made available to all those who wish to participate, and should be accessible to those with disabilities. The consultation process should be open to all, and should be conducted in a way that is fair and impartial. The consultation document should be open to all, and should be accessible to all those who wish to participate. The consultation process should be open to all, and should be conducted in a way that is fair and impartial.
Prefered Opportunities Consultant
Tenning District Local Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2023-01-01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning, Feasibility Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-01-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Design, Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-02-01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Construction, Implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please note:**

The new project has been successfully integrated into the existing community. Further work on the project should be completed with the project teams. Data from this project has been successfully integrated into the existing system.

We note in the section of the report that the numbers quoted represent a percentage of total stock.
This plan must recognize the urgent need to assess the requirements for education in

The Portland Plan, in particular, the schools for post-16 education included in this plan

will help to be delivered.

(continued, page 3)

The population of teenagers is expected to at least 1,500 during the next few years. This is

for the growth and development of the Portland Plan. In the short term, we can expect this
termination, the increasing growth in customer and the expected population in the

area over the next few years.

The increasing pressure on the customer who form College and the College insists to accept

the College is, in fact, forming College to study for their lives.

In the college, in fact, the pressure is to form College and for many years our students have provided in

these students have formed College by this College and for many years. Our students have provided in

these students have formed College. The College is not the major of
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We are convinced that they plan for the College is, in fact, forming College to study for their lives.

The College is, in fact, forming College to study for their lives.

In the college, in fact, the pressure is to form College and for many years. Our students have provided in

these students have formed College by this College and for many years. Our students have provided in

these students have formed College. The College is not the major of

these in College, the College is similarly expanding. Our students have provided in

the college is, in fact, forming College to study for their lives.

We are convinced that they plan for the College is, in fact, forming College to study for their lives.

The College is, in fact, forming College to study for their lives.
New development around the Knutsford area need to incorporate attractive new developments. This document will provide a summary of recent developments and proposals for the area. The proposals are based on feedback from local residents and stakeholders.

Residential development

The proposals include

- Extensive new housing
- Commercial and retail developments
- Infrastructure improvements

These proposals are based on extensive consultation with local residents and stakeholders. The Council has consulted with local residents and stakeholders, and the proposals are based on their feedback.

In conclusion, the proposals are a balanced mix of new housing and commercial developments. They are designed to meet the needs of the local community and to enhance the existing infrastructure.

The proposals are supported by a range of new developments, including

- Extensive new housing
- Commercial and retail developments
- Infrastructure improvements

These proposals are based on extensive consultation with local residents and stakeholders. The Council has consulted with local residents and stakeholders, and the proposals are based on their feedback.

In conclusion, the proposals are a balanced mix of new housing and commercial developments. They are designed to meet the needs of the local community and to enhance the existing infrastructure.
The novel approach to Par-1 aims to explore the role of newly identified factors in cancer development. We report the identification of novel regulators of transcriptional activity and their potential role in cancer progression. These findings suggest that targeting Par-1 may offer a new therapeutic strategy for the treatment of various cancers.

We further investigate the role of Par-1 in regulating the expression of key genes involved in cell proliferation and survival. Our results indicate that Par-1 interacts with a variety of transcription factors, including MYC, to modulate the expression of genes that contribute to tumorigenesis.

The identification of these novel regulators of Par-1 activity opens up new avenues for the development of targeted therapies. Further research is needed to elucidate the molecular mechanisms underlying the interaction between Par-1 and these transcription factors, and to develop effective strategies for their inhibition. This knowledge could have significant implications for the development of novel therapeutic approaches in cancer treatment.
The council planners must have a process of Post Occupancy Review in order to support

- if the development is not successful,
- The director council approves applications for Housing and Developments only if
- these issues should be addressed and reassessment taken to local residents before any
- the interest on outstanding development
- the interest on the outstanding debt is due to a higher rate
- the council takes a decision on outstanding issues
- the council takes action on outstanding issues
- the council takes action on outstanding issues
- the council takes action on outstanding issues
- the council takes action on outstanding issues
- the council takes action on outstanding issues
- the council takes action on outstanding issues

Better Planning for the Future.
Dear Sirs

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

Please find enclosed our response to the above. This letter will also be hand delivered to the Weeley Office this afternoon.

Regards
Tracey Pulford
Town Clerk
Bertilngsea Town Council

Please consider your environmental responsibility before printing this e-mail
Dear Sirs

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

Brightlingsea Town Council would like to make the following comments on the above:

Policy PPL 2 – Coastal Protection Belt
(Special reference to paragraph 7.10 and 7.11)

The area of the Local Plan that covers Wicks Wood and Lodge Wood and up to All Saints and Brightlingsea Hall Conservation Area should remain and not be deleted as shown.

The Town Council is concerned that removal of the Coastal Protection Belt at this area could compromise the nearby SSSI as well as the woods and the Grade I Listed Buildings in the Conservation Area, should any development occur.

Policy HP3 – Green Infrastructure
(Special reference to paragraph 4.34)

The Western Promenade is not mentioned and we feel it should be a Safeguarded Local Green Space

Local Maps C.5 Brightlingsea – Map 9 Brightlingsea
We feel it would be helpful if the car parks be denoted on the map, and feel this is an omission.

The Town Council otherwise supports the plan for Brightlingsea.

Yours faithfully

Tracey Pulford
Town Clerk

Mayor of Brightlingsea: Councillor Karen Yallop

Town Clerk: Tracey Pulford
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,
Weele
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>
<th>Agent's Name: (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:*</td>
<td>Agent's address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postcode:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode:</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation: Member of Weeley Residents Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td>*Required information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Planning Policy Manager  
Tendring District Council  
Council Offices  
Thorpe Road  
Weeley  
Essex. CO16 9AY

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 accessibility 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 Aylesford 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 Weeley 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 Weeley 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 Weeley, 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 Duty 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 Weeley 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
April 2016

<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>Alresford</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>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe-le-Soken</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weoley</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>Weoley 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>Alresford</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</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>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe-le-Soken</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weoley</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>Weoley 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>
1. 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’.

2. 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.

3. Weeley has a railway station with a POOR, in fact appalling service. See 2 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 line. 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 farmers 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 Jigges (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 9JJ

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 Jiggins, 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>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROSPEROUS PLACES</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy PP1: New Retail Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PP2: Retail Hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PP3: Village and Neighbourhood Centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PP4: Local Impact Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PP5: Town Centre Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PP6: Employment Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PP7: Employment Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PP8: Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PP9: Hotels and Guesthouses</td>
<td></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>

**PROTECTED PLACES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Vary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPL1</td>
<td>Development and Flood Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL2</td>
<td>Coastal Protection Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL3</td>
<td>The Rural Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL4</td>
<td>Biodiversity and Geodiversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL5</td>
<td>Water Conservation, Drainage and Sewerage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL6</td>
<td>Strategic Gaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL7</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL8</td>
<td>Conservation Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL9</td>
<td>Listed Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL10</td>
<td>Enabling Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL11</td>
<td>Renewable Energy Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL12</td>
<td>The Avenues Area of Special Character, Frinton-On-Sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL13</td>
<td>The Gardens Area of Special Character, Clacton-On-Sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL14</td>
<td>Ardeleigh Reservoir Catchment Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL15</td>
<td>Safeguarding of Civil Technical Site, North East of Little Clacton/South of Thorpe-Le-Soken</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>
### 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CP3: Improving The Telecommunications Network</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.

———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.
Please find attached The Harwich Society written representations on the Tendring Local Plan Preferred Options document which we request are taken into account.

Regards

Richard Colley
Harwich Society Trustee
Dear Planning Policy Manager

Tendring Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation (2016)

The Harwich Society welcomes the publication of the Local Plan Preferred Options document and the opportunity to comment on the emerging policies. We request the following representations are taken into account:

Cultural Heritage
As the local civic society for the Harwich area and the custodian of most of the ancient monuments in the town we welcome the policies seeking to protect the cultural heritage of the District. Historic buildings and historic places such as Harwich are major assets for residents and visitors alike and add to the distinctiveness and prosperity of the district.

It is essential that conservation continues to be promoted positively in the local plan.

This expression of support relates to Policies PPL7, PPL8 and PPL9.

Infrastructure
We are concerned that the level of growth proposed in the area is supported by appropriate and timely infrastructure. The document recognises the need to plan for infrastructure enhancements but fails to identify any specific proposals. In the Harwich area the proposal to allocate 16.2 hectares of land for employment land and land for 819 new homes in addition to the 500 new homes recently granted planning permission will generate additional demand for services, physical and social infrastructure. It can be expected that this demand will require the allocation of some new or extended sites.

The potential demand for infrastructure should be assessed with the responsible organisations now, the land use requirements for infrastructure to support growth identified and reserved as part of the local plan policy process and not left to be negotiated later on a site by site basis at the planning application stage.
Facilities which have land use implications and locational requirements such as schools, health facilities, increased demand for public car parking in town centres and community services need to be appropriately sited and reserved in the local plan to ensure the planning process delivers a good future for the population and businesses in the area.

This objection relates to Policies HP1, HP2, CP2, PP5 and Section 9 Delivering Infrastructure.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted]

for the Harwich Society
Good Afternoon

Please find attached a copy of the comments for submission by the Ramsey & Parkeston Parish Council to the TDC Local Plan 2013 to 2033 and Beyond - Preferred Options Consultation Document in line with the deadline of 8th September 2016.

Kind regards

Lin Keating
Clerk
Ramsey & Parkeston Parish Council
The Ramsey & Parkeston Parish Council submit the following comments for consideration to the draft Local Plan:

It is the general consensus that the document does not list the proposed development sites for easy identification, therefore making the consultation process unnecessarily difficult and lengthy.

1. Referring to Local Map 20 of the draft document (page 204) – Harwich and Dovercourt (including Parkeston and part of Ramsey)

   a) St Michaels Church being under a Conservation Area as shown to be under the RDC Conservation Area Review, March 2006, page 3, stating:

   "The church is an impressive building, dating back to the 12th Century with square-headed Elizabethan windows to the chancel and a massively-butressed west tower."

   The Ramsey & Parkeston Parish Council request that this church is listed within the Heritage Assets within the draft Local Plan.

   b) The proposed Linear Park sited North of the A120, Ramsey is not indicated as an area as Safeguarded Local Green Spaces.

2. Land West of Mayes Lane (adjacent to Two Village School)
   Ramsey & Parkeston Parish Council wholly support the site being removed from the draft Local Plan.

3. Land South of Ramsey Road, Ramsey (Former Horse Rangers Site)
   The Ramsey & Parkeston Parish Council request that this site, proposed for development of 90 dwellings, is removed from the Local Plan due to the following points:
   - Referring to Preferred Options Consultation Document TDC Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond, page 69, 2.59:

     ‘Within the plan period new residential development in these settlements will be limited to small infill sites within Settlement Development Boundaries which will support the overall housing growth for the District.’

     This site is not considered to be a small infill site.

   - Referring to Preferred Options Consultation Document TDC Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond, page 71, Policy SPL 3 Sustainable Design Part C Impacts and Compatibility: the proposed development does not meet the criteria of those policy due to:

     a) the development is not sustainable with current infrastructure deemed inadequate.
     b) the water mains currently struggles with the households reliant on it at present, and it will not be able to support an additional 90 households.
     c) flooding into the village of Ramsey is regular due to the inadequacy of the current pumping station; an additional 90 dwellings would only add to the problem for the residents of Ramsey Village.
     d) issues with the electricity substation tripping on occasion, due to demand from current households, would not be able to support an additional 90 households.
     e) 90 additional households would put additional pressure on the already oversubscribed Two Village School with concerns of the quality of education delivered to the children attending the school.
The preferred options consultation.

Tenancy District Local Plan
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The Tennessee Commission on Postsecondary Education in the Tennessee Department of Education has been established in this plan and will be advised and supported by a Board of Directors.

The initiative of Tennessee is to increase at least 5,500 students in the next five years, either in the Tennessee Board of Regents or the Tennessee Advanced Education Program. The state has set a goal of increasing the Tennessee Board of Regents' enrollment to 25,000 students by 2025, with at least 5,500 of those students continuing their education in Tennessee without leaving Tennessee. This goal is in line with the state's overall goal of increasing the percentage of adults with a postsecondary degree or certificate to 60% by 2025.

The Tennessee Commission on Postsecondary Education in the Tennessee Department of Education has been established in this plan and will be advised and supported by a Board of Directors.

The initiative of Tennessee is to increase at least 5,500 students in the next five years, either in the Tennessee Board of Regents or the Tennessee Advanced Education Program. The state has set a goal of increasing the Tennessee Board of Regents' enrollment to 25,000 students by 2025, with at least 5,500 of those students continuing their education in Tennessee without leaving Tennessee. This goal is in line with the state's overall goal of increasing the percentage of adults with a postsecondary degree or certificate to 60% by 2025.
New developments around the Loughborough area need to incorporate attractive, community-focused public spaces that contribute to open green and blue space. Existing and proposed commercial and industrial developments should be encouraged to ensure that the area remains attractive and viable for businesses and residents.

The Council welcomes the potential benefits that new developments can bring, but it is essential that any new developments are well-planned and take into account the needs of the local community. This includes ensuring that new developments are sustainable, that they are safe and that they do not have a negative impact on the environment.

The current local plan sets out the Council's planning policies and objectives for the area, and it is important that any new developments are in line with these policies. The Council will consider any applications for new developments on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the requirements of the local plan and the needs of the local community.
The Green Line is the only rail line that runs through the southern half of the city. This line connects the neighborhoods of the south side to the Loop and other parts of the city. The Green Line is also an important part of the city's public transportation system and is used by many people to get around the city. It is a key part of the city's transportation infrastructure and is used by many people to get to work, school, and other important destinations. The Green Line is also an important part of the city's economy, as it helps to connect the city's businesses and industries to each other and to the rest of the country. Overall, the Green Line is an important part of the city's transportation system and plays a crucial role in the economic and social well-being of the city.
The council obtains permission to develop the land. A plan for development can only be approved for access. Any other real people take the decision and develop the land. Once the development is complete, the council can only undertake as much work on drainage, water, and electricity and a plan is submitted for planning. The district council approves the plan for development and development starts. The planning must be made to have clear, long-term development and a protected area.

The issues should be addressed and reassessment taken to local residents before any
Prefered Options Consultation
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Tendring District Local Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021-01-01</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-01-02</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-01-03</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-01-04</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-01-05</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note:

This report is based on data available as of December 2021. The data includes all applications approved, and no additional applications have been approved since then.

Please see the note at the bottom of the report for further details.
This plan must recognize the unique need to assess the requirements for education in the future. Will they be educated?

The population of the future is likely to increase at least 2.5% during the next few years. Where for the present and predicted population growth in the future, we can expect that the present number of students will increase, a reassessment of post-secondary (third from students) education is required. Children with greater access to secondary education post-secondary education in the future will be needed to fill these increased educational needs in the future. Children from lower income families will need educational opportunities that are not currently available.

The increase in children from lower income families is due to the increase in children from families with lower income levels. The increase in children from lower income families is due to the increase in children from families with lower income levels. The increase in children from lower income families is due to the increase in children from families with lower income levels.

The improvement in the education of children from lower income families is due to the increase in children from families with lower income levels. The increase in children from lower income families is due to the increase in children from families with lower income levels. The increase in children from lower income families is due to the increase in children from families with lower income levels.
support the adoption of the Western Expressed Development Procedure in the

improve and neglect the established connections and other factors, the section is developed,

dissect and neglect to express this need. The development also provides the potential to

deserted areas to live within easy reach of all centres and a vehicle road

The Garden Community Project should be planned at the location mentioned above.

both areas.

from another, but is no more than a meaningless statement.

is built (including the 320 000 homes, etc. which form the railway station),

This approach does not interfere with the existing public transport network; it is only a supplementary

from another.

The approach around the station is approved by the railway station and Mackenzie Road.

The most significant feature for development in the Phase Partners is the main railway station.

The Garden Community Project should be planned at the location mentioned above.
The council planners must have a process of post-occupancy reviews in order to support better planning for the future.

Any after feel good data on a project and 60 days later data that the development can truly explain and make a change to a development’s plan is planned can only work if the planning is not just seen as a plan.

The District Council approves applications for planning and developments and both issues are.

All applications must be made to the Local Planning Department of the District Council.

The Local Council’s Development Plan is

- The galaxy of the planning district during development.
- The access to any access roads or public transport in the locality.
- The potential of an increased spending due to a high future value.
- The transformation of underground systems.
- The increased pressure on local GPs, dentists.
COMMENTS FROM GREAT OAKLEY PARISH COUNCIL

Dear Ms Foster,

Further to the publication of the draft "Tendring District Local Plan 2013 - 2033 and Beyond - Preferred Options Document" in July 2016 I would like to make the following representation on behalf of Great Oakley Parish Council (including the village of Stones Green).

Throughout the past several years of consultation and the numerous public meetings we have held, the reinstatement of the Settlement Development Boundary for Stones Green had been included and was shown within the maps in the "Smaller Rural Settlement" category and Great Oakley Parish Council have previously formally written to TDC to confirm our support for some appropriate scale development on the sites previously proposed within that boundary.

At each revision (until now) it was included and we were assured by Mr Guiver that it would remain so.

In this latest draft it has disappeared.

Past experience has shown that, since the removal of the settlement boundary by the 2007 Local Plan, any Planning Application for a new development within the village has been rejected on the grounds that the site is in the Green Belt and does not form part of an established settlement, which of course is ridiculous as the village has been there for well over 400 years.

Without the reinstated Settlement Development Boundary this situation is likely to remain the case, which in turn would result in the stagnation of the village until at least 2033.

In this basis, we would request that the Stones Green Settlement Development Boundary, as shown in the previous drafts of your new plan and supported by the Parish Council, is reinstated.

Yours sincerely,

Steve Huk
Chairman - Great Oakley Parish Council
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.

SP5 - Vary
The seventh bullet point should have “and expanded settlements.” After the words Urban areas.

Reason
So more areas can benefit from this Policy.

SP6 - 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.

SP7 - Support
SP8 - Support
SP9 - Support
SP10 - Support

Delivery Arrangements - Support
Part 2: 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”
Insert new item g) “That all large developments must have highways, raised curbs and footpaths built to a standard that can be adopted by the Essex County Council.”
Reason: To improve our future housing stock.
Insert new item h) “Housing mix should recognise and reflect the age Demographics of the District, with priority given to increasing the housing stock of bungalows”.
Reason: To ensure housing stock is appropriate to local needs.

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 mediocre buildings and services, and we will lose the character encouraged by smaller concerns.

**PP10 - Vary** Add Recreational Vehicle Parks

**Reason**
There is great need for specific places for overnight parking For RVs.

**PP11 - Vary** We support this but would ask officers to strengthen the last three paragraphs wherever possible.

**PP12 - Vary** In objective 2 of “Prosperous Places” we suggested Removing Renewable energy and inserting Tourism and SME’s. The first paragraph of this policy should therefore include reference to these industry training/skill requirements.
Add to the end of last paragraph the words: “and prioritise employment of local people”

**Reason**
to ensure “improving Education and skills” reflects our needs.

**PP13 - Vary** in point c. change “essential” to “key”

**Reason**
Is there another Policy that will allow for individual dwellings of significance to be created from redundant farm buildings?

**PP14 - Support** Add after Community safety and accessibility, “The B1033 is key to Walton development”

**7 Protected Places**

In first bullet point of pre-amble, change completely to: “minimising the risk to human life, property and countryside from flooding and coastal erosion.”

**PPL1 - Vary** Remove the Exception test paragraph and 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.
Thanks Rosemary,

Naomi / Mary this is to be added to Rosemary’s rep.

Regars,

Simon Meecham
Planning and Regulation

01255 686115 smeecham@tendringdc.gov.uk www.tendringdc.gov.uk

Tendring District Council, Council Offices, Thorpe Road, Weele, Essex, CO16 9A1

Speaking with the Planning Service about building work or development? Have you spoken with our Building Control Service too? Our team can help you meet Government-set building regulations for the safe design and construction of buildings (including energy efficiency and access requirements). Email them on bckinspections@tendringdc.gov.uk or telephone 01255 686111, or look at our website via the following link Building Control for more information.

From: Cllr. Rosemary Heaney
Sent: 08 September 2016 15:30
To: Simon Meecham

Subject: Local Plan Consultation

Dear Simon

Please can you add this to my submission.

I am totally opposed to the idea that the proposed development at Tendring Central (Frating and Gt. Bromley), which will come before the planning inspector at the local plan inquiry, should then be included in the local plan. Large developments in this area were dismissed by the last two local plan planning inspectors at their inquiries, and the reasons they gave for doing so are still valid.

Many thanks
Rosemary
Local plan
It is noted that Brightlingsea has had the flood protection removed from most of the area.
It is essential it is put back around the whole area as in the previous plan.
Although you may state that no planning applications would be passed in these area, to protect the area the flood protection must be reinstated.

Regards
Jayne Chapman
Brightlingsea
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

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Hugh Frostick" [mailto:]
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'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.
Good morning

Please find attached, Harwich Town Council's submission to the above consultation.

Regards
Lucy

Lucy Ballard
Clerk and Responsible Financial Officer
Harwich Town Council
The Guildhall
Church Street
Harwich, Essex
CO12 3DS
Tel: 01255 507211
Email: info@harwichtowncouncil.co.uk
www.harwichtowncouncil.co.uk

Office hours: 9.30am - 1pm Mon, Weds, Fri
Mr Simon Meecham,
Planning Policy and Regulation Manager
Council Offices
Thorpe Road, Weeley
Essex
CO16 9AJ

18 August 2016

Dear Simon

The Tendring District Local Plan- Preferred Options Consultation Document 2013–2033 and Beyond.

Thank you for your letters dated 14th and 27th July in relation to the preferred option consultation document which was circulated to members accordingly.

At a meeting of the Council’s Planning Committee on 16th August, members were content with the proposals and maintain our stance for Horseley Cross to be included in any future plan. On the whole, members were supportive of the proposals; however, they were keen to reiterate some of the comments previously submitted on 28th January 2014 regarding the pre-submission focused changes and make some additional comments.

Housing Allocation

1. Land Adjacent to Harwich Town Football Ground – HTC raises concern about the future loss of parking for the Harwich and Parkeston football and social club if the existing car park is included in the area to be developed.

2. Land Adjacent to 360 Main Road – Mayflower School Site – HTC believes that this site should be removed from the proposed housing allocation as any development on this site is inappropriate.

3. Land East of Pond Hall Farm – HTC withdraws its previous comments as the application to develop on this site is already under consideration.

Development at Harwich School – HTC supports the desire of the Harwich High School to deliver a new fit for purpose 6th Form Centre on its main site and endorses any policies (and safeguards as laid out) set out to achieve this.
Industrial

Development at Horsley Cross – HTC strongly supports the inclusion of the development at Horsley Cross as it believes that this site offers the best opportunity for immediately deliverable inward investment and growth, offering employment opportunities for the residents of Harwich and Dovercourt.

High Street

- Policy PP5 – Protection of retail sites/ Town centres – HTC supports TDC policy in line with national policy for protecting town center retail sites.

General Comments

HTC believes that the existing community, leisure and sporting facilities within the town are already inadequate and in need of upgrading and would require major modernisation to meet any increased pressure for future developments. With the proposed number of new dwellings and the direct effect this is expected to have on the future population figures, as well as an increase in aging population. HTC has grave concerns that the infrastructure to support this growing town will not be in place. The local plan includes no allocation of land for the future provision for parking in either the town center or historic Harwich for either residents or visitors. Similarly, there is a need for stronger public transport provision and major improvements to the A120, to accommodate those commuting from Harwich.

Further concern is raised over the future provision of medical services. Residents are already seeing the effects of this given that the main medical center servicing the locality has recently closed its books to new patients with other nearby surgeries under similar pressure.

With the increase in families to the area being anticipated HTC are concerned that both primary and secondary school allocation within the parish is going to become near on impossible, forcing parents to seek availability outside of the area. Similarly, there is a strong need for additional play areas and community centers and HTC would ask that any s106 monies /CIL generated from developments are reinvested in Harwich and Dovercourt.

Yours sincerely

Ms Lucy Ballard
Clerk to the Council and Responsible Financial Officer
From: Josie Close
Sent: 07 September 2016 00:51
To: Planning, policy
Subject: Tendring District Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation Document
Attachments: FWHT_comments.LocalPlan_2013-2033_7.9.16.doc

Representation from the Frinton and Walton Heritage Trust
See attached

--
Dr Josie Close
FWHT Executive Committee Member
Frinton & Walton Heritage Trust (FWHT) welcomes the statements in the Local Plan (2013-2033) concerning the importance of conserving and enhancing Tendring’s heritage. It is noted that the Local Plan refers to heritage in its broadest sense. FWHT supports this policy and objective.

FWHT welcomes the Local Plan’s acknowledgement that Tendring’s ecological assets are key to its attractiveness and tourist economy but ‘sensitive to development pressures’ and that the Naze’s natural and wild coastline is an ‘increasingly rare example’ while its rich geo-diversity is ‘largely irreplaceable’. FWHT welcomes this vision and strongly supports Local Plan policy and objectives to maintain them.

FWHT is particularly appreciative that The Avenues in Frinton are specifically identified for conservation and strongly supports this policy.

FWHT also supports the regeneration of Walton with sensitive, quality design and appropriate, innovative job-creation within the town.

FWHT particularly welcomes the recognition in the Local Plan that community facilities are assets promoting health and well-being through education and leisure. As a charity providing facilities for the community in Frinton & Walton and general neighbourhood, FWHT welcomes the statement in the Local Plan that ‘the Council should work with partners to improve and protect facilities against redevelopment for alternative uses’. As community facilities are such an asset their viability is critical and so FWHT welcomes and supports the stated planning policy to guard against their loss and ensure their ability to develop and modernise in a sustainable way to benefit the community. FWHT strongly supports this policy and objective.

As regards new development, FWHT has concerns that the jobs-led model for housing need is not sufficiently supported by existing economic activity. Moreover, the Technical Study, *Objectively Assessed Housing Need* by Peter Brett Associates, identifies the lack of robust data on which to base demographic projections for Tendring’s population growth. The Unattributable Population Change (UPC) at -9000 does not suggest immediate high demand. The John Hollis study - independently commissioned - proposes 480 new dwellings per year. In the Local Plan this is increased to 550 new dwellings per year without apparent justification. Critically, Tendring’s services infrastructure requires investment to meet such growth and the Local Plan does not detail the budget or how this will be achieved.

FWHT requires further substantiation of the data and figures before this level of growth can be supported.

Dr Josie Close
On behalf of the Chairholder and Executive Committee of the Frinton & Walton Heritage Trust.
7 September 2016
Submission from Little Clacton Parish Council
Re Draft Local Plan Sept 2016

26/08/16

Following a special meeting of LCPC the following observations were made by Full Council.

LCPC considers the numbers that this Draft Local Plan is based on are flawed. We strongly urge TDC to reconsider the numbers and reconsider the proposed allocation of housing to a more even distribution especially to the northern A120/ A133. We feel the present planned distribution especially towards Clacton- On- sea are unworkable in so much as the infrastructure is not in place.

It is still our considered view that the A120/ A133 corridor offers the best option for both residential and business. We believe that even in our own area better use of disused brownfield sites especially those with potential to access on to the A133 as we have in the way of disused greenhouses in Bateman Lane, that way take the traffic away from the Villages. New access on to the A133 in the form of a roundabout would help in calming a accident hot spot. Whist we recommend these alternatives they have to satisfy ourselves that they are in the Villages interest in they way of size, design and access.

We find the Draft local Plan very weak and open to misinterpretation. We object to the proposed inclusion of land west of Thorpe Rd (C-O-S and Jaywick part B map) Dalau site being proposed as Employment zone. This area is Green Gap and should remain so. Little Clacton Parish Council is against any development that compromises the Green Gap, that is a policy we regard as sacrosanct. The proposed employment zone should go across Thorpe Rd / Stephenson Rd where business area already is, there is more than enough area there to accommodate.

Equally we feel this area being proposed as an extension of Oakwood Pk for mixed use, needs to have a Green wedge in the way of a LOWS on the eastern boundary with the railway. This would accommodate any displacement of wildlife from this large rural area. We would also suggest that the Northern boundary of this area be a green zone as Holland Rd / Sladsbury Lane would not be able to take increased traffic.

Policy LP6 is too woolly and ambiguous and is not in our view robust enough to protect Rural Exception Sites from Urbanization if it was to be approved specific wording would have to be changed.

Wording page 92 Policy LP6 second parr: the word Parish should replace Council.

Wording page 93 Policy LP6 par C wider geographical should be replaced with Tendring District.

We also strongly urge the council to reinstate the safeguards from Policy SD3 into the Plan to protect Rural Exemption Sites from Urbanization or incorporate the 50 dwellings limit in that policy. We understand it was dropped because on appeal Govt. Inspectors refused to accept that policy but that was only because of presumption in favour of developer and No Local Plan in place. In our view that was a good policy that served us well and should therefore be reinstated.
Within the map of Little Clacton we are concerned that the area within our settlement area of Engaines School playing field is not showing as protected. That area needs to be identified as protected as agreed by PO Gary Guiver. In conclusion we find the proposed Local Plan in it present form being unacceptable. It appears to be open to misinterpretation on many counts and needs to be more robust.

There is no safeguard in policy LP6 to protect Rural Exception sites from Urbanization. The 50 dwellings maximum must be added. Therefore it is our considered opinion that unless the changes we suggest are administered we would have to deem the present proposed Local Plan unworkable not in the interest of Little Clacton and the Rural Exception Sites and therefore recommend **REJECTION** of this Plan.

Little Clacton Parish Council.
TENDRING DISTRICT COUNCIL
COUNCIL OFFICES
THORPE ROAD
WEELEY
ESSEX
CO16 9AJ

12th August 2016

Dear Sir

Re: Local Plan and Kirby le Soken Village Plans

Please find attached Kirby le Soken's Village Plan, whilst it is still in draft this is because we are currently awaiting approval from the Council.

As a village we are submitting the plan in response to the local plan and we wish to ask that our plan is adopted as part of the Local Plan.

Our plan we believe clearly documents the views of the residents of Kirby le Soken and gives valuable information to help the Council make future planning decisions.

Yours faithfully

Victoria S Burgoyne

On behalf of the Kirby Le Soken Village Preservation Society - Village Plan Sub Committee
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1. FOREWORD

Village plans have become a critical part of local governance and the planning system. They provide a document for residents to express collective views on the character of their community, draw attention to the features they most value, and have a stronger voice in shaping the place they live.

Kirby-le-Soken has a unique identity to preserve and enhance. It possesses a rich and natural heritage that includes a conservation area, the Millennium Wood which operates under the Woodland Trust, and is bordering an international nature reserve the Walton Backwaters recognised for the outstanding quality of its environment and wildlife i.e. an area of Special Scientific Interest.

The history of the village dates back to Roman and Saxon times, while the stories of more recent generations past, lie preserved in its listed buildings and unspoiled country vistas. Today it remains a fiercely independent community, distinct and separate from the encroachment of its neighbours Frinton-on-Sea, Walton-on-the-Naze, and Kirby Cross.

This document has been a number of years in the making, and is the result of many careful hours spent gathering the opinions of residents. The committee wish to thank everyone involved in the creation of this document, and all who took the time to contribute their views.

The Kirby le Soken Parish Plan and Village Design Statement documents and records details of the village in the present, the views of its people, and a shared vision for how Kirby-le-Soken should evolve in the future.

We hope that you enjoy reading it.

The Village Preservation Society sub-committee

Victoria Burgoyne – Chairman
Joe Webster – Secretary
John Beale – Treasurer
Luke Webster
David Wood
Andrew Burgoyne
2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Purpose of this document

It has been the policy of successive Governments to devolve greater powers to local level and strengthen the role of communities in their own development. The role of Parish Plans and Village Design Statements is now well established, and the 2012 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) set out how these policy plans should contribute to the achievement of sustainable forms of development.

It is intended that the Kirby-le-Soken Parish Plan and Village Design Statement, when adopted by Tendring District Council, will become a supplementary planning document and a material consideration in the assessment and determination of future planning applications in the village. It will also provide a valuable resource for policymakers and local bodies charged with other decisions that affect residents.

2.2 Aims and scope

The preparation of this document has been overseen by a sub-committee of Kirby le Soken’s Village Preservation Society, comprised of volunteers. The document and subsequent action plan represent the views of the Kirby’s residents obtained through a survey distributed to all households in the village as well as meetings held throughout the process. In producing this document we have taken every effort to reflect the views of the whole village.

This document does not set out to crystallise the village in its current time, or downplay the pressure for change within the wider Tendring area. It does, however, make clear that future changes must reflect the special identity of the village, the real constraints that exist to further development and the voice of all who live here and contribute to the life of the community. It intends to seek and to stimulate practical action to improve the experience of residents living in Kirby le Soken, and businesses which trade within the village.
Our Village

- On the Tendring Peninsular
- Nestled between Frinton on Sea, Walton on Naze, Kirby Cross and Thorpe le Soken
- Access to the Walton Backwaters
- Access to the Millennium Woods, planted in 2000 for the Millennium by The Woodland Trust
- The Village Shop and Post Office
- Two Pubs – The Ship and The Red Lion
- A Garage
- Two Churches St Michaels, and The Kirby le Soken Evangelical Church
- St Michael’s Church Hall
- The Kirby Playing Fields with a Tennis, Football, Cricket Club and Bowls Club
- A number of village events during the year
- Other businesses include Silverton’s Aggregates
- Three Care Homes
- Essex County Council Civic Amenity and Recycling Centre
3. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

- Kirby-le-Soken is an older community, but one that has a strong sense of community spirit. Residents are typically proud of the area they live in and want to contribute to it.

- Residents are broadly satisfied with the quality of the local services, and existing facilities within the village receive strong support.

- Preserving the village identity is a key priority, and an overwhelming majority of residents are concerned about the capacity of the village to cope with further significant housing developments.

- Transport infrastructure is also seen as a major challenge, with the volume of traffic including HGV’s and pinch points within the village presenting a particular safety concern.

- Residents are keen to ensure that the village retains a strong appeal to all ages, but acknowledge that there are limited facilities for the younger population.
4. OUR VILLAGE AND IT’S HISTORY

Kirby-le-Soken is a small village in the Tendring District of North East Essex, England, in an agricultural and increasingly residential corner of the county. Although the village has managed to stay distinct and separate from the growing conurbations of Frinton-on-Sea and Walton-on-the-Naze (formerly Walton-le-Soken).

Kirby-le-Soken today still has the feel of a traditional English village; it is situated in an area of land called the Le-Sokens in Essex and is isolated from Kirby Cross, Frinton-on-Sea and Walton-on-the-Naze by fields. Kirby was originally a scattered farming community with an upper and lower road. Many people still refer to the village as lower Kirby with the upper road now known as Kirby Cross. The village can be entered by three routes, from the West or East on the B1034 or from the South by coming down Halstead Road from Kirby Cross.

In 1870-72, John Marius Wilson’s *Imperial Gazetteer of England and Wales* described Kirby le Sokens:

**KIRBY-LE-SOKEN, a village and a parish in Tendring district, Essex.** The village stands adjacent to the Colchester and Walton railway, 2 miles W by N of Walton steam boat pier, and 12 by road SSW of Harwich; and has a station on the railway, and a post office under Colchester. The parish contains also the hamlets of Kirby-Cross, Sneating, and Upper-Street; and includes several islands and marshes on the N. Acres, 4, 757. Real property, £5, 880. Pop., 879. Houses, 182. The property is divided among a few. There is a wharf on a creek. The living is a vicarage in the diocese of Rochester. Value, £240.* Patron, Three Trustees. The church was partly rebuilt in 1833, at a cost of £1,200; and it retains the original chancel and tower. There are chapels for Wesleyans and Primitive Methodists, a parochial school, and charities £13.

It is believed the creation of the village started back in the Neolithic times. Evidence of occupation during Roman times has also been identified. There have also been a good number of medieval pottery shards found and continue to be found, therefore it is suspected that pottery was being made in the village.
In 1066 Kirby, together with Walton and Thorpe, formed part of St. Paul's Cathedral's great estate or soke of Naze. Leases suggest that there were three sub-divisions of the estate, later the manors of Kirby-le-Soken, Thorpe-le-Soken, and Walton-le-Soken. Kirby-le-Soken was first recorded as a separate unit in 1222. There were two other manors in Kirby-le-Soken, Birch Hall in the north of the parish, had been created before 1066, the second and probably in existence by the late 11th century later known as Sneating Hall.

The principal manor of Kirby-le-Soken, otherwise Kirby Hall, was granted by the crown together with Walton Hall and Thorpe Hall to Lord Darcy of Chiche in 1551 and thereafter ownership continued to descend with the rest of the Sokens. However, the lands of the manor had been alienated in the mid-17th century, probably to pay the debts of Elizabeth, Countess Rivers (d. 1651). It descended in the Honeywood family of Marks Hall (Marks Hall) from the late 17th until the early 20th century.

Most manorial lords, lay and ecclesiastical, were non-resident, having their principal residences and estates elsewhere. However, there was an important local connection with St. Osyth abbey, both through the abbey's ownership of Birch Hall in the Middle Ages, and later because the site of the former abbey became the seat of the barons Darcy of Chiche and earls of Rochford. All three manors and estates in the parish, Kirby Hall, Birch Hall and Sneating Hall, were typically leased in the Middle Ages. In the mid to late 19th century both Birch Hall and Sneating Hall were temporarily held by members of the Foaker family, prominent in the administration of the Soken manors, who may have lived on their estates.

As at the other Soken manors of Walton Hall and Thorpe Hall, neither the lords of the manor nor the new owners of the landed estate after it had been sold were resident. The dean and chapter of St. Paul's leased their estates in the Middle Ages, a policy probably continued by Lord Darcy of Chiche in 1581. The Honeywood family of Marks Hall, new owners of the landed estate in the later 17th century, also leased the manorial demesne. The tenant farmers, such as Robert Mumford in 1840, typically occupied a central position in the social and political life of the community. The house, Kirby Hall, was occupied by the lord of the manor, C.J. Honeywood, Jr., between 1906 and 1908, but it was afterwards leased again to private residents. No manor house was recorded at Kirby in 1222 or 1297 despite the creation of a demesne farm in the intervening period; presumably there was no need for one as the land was typically leased with other parts of the Naze estate. Neither does there appear to have been a domestic residence in the mid-15th century, although by 1457 there were agricultural buildings, a kitchen and a small house with a cellar in which the court of the Soken (curia del Sokne) was held. The existing red brick house of c. 1700, located south of Lower Kirby Street immediately behind and south west of the church and vicarage, was presumably a rebuilding by J.L. or Robert Honeywood on an earlier site.

The manor descended with Walton Hall and Thorpe Hall as part of the lordship of the Sokens, passing from the dean and chapter of St. Paul's to the barons Darcy of Chiche, the earls of Rochford, and their successors including Richard Rigby, Charles Pearson, and Benjamin and Edward Chapman. Emma Elizabeth Freeman of Chertsey (Surrey) and Clara Freeman of Canterbury (Kent), 'ladies of the manor' in 1928, were the last owners to exercise manorial rights. At Walton Hall and Thorpe Hall, J.L. Beaumont of Coggleshall served as the last steward of the manor, and the firm of Beaumont and Sansom sold it to Leslie Maddock of Mettingham Castle (Suff.) c. 1963, presumably on behalf of the Freemans' heirs.
Access to the Sea

Originally there were two quays in the village. The first at the end of Coalies Lane, perhaps called this because coal was imported to here? But it was also called Old Quay Lane. This was the first Quay and it is thought to date back to the 17th century. The other quay is at the end of Quay Lane and was used commercially until around the 1920's. Barges would bring horse manure and timber from London and take straw, hay; grain and bricks back to London, and also trade to ports around the east and south coasts of England. The Quay at the end of Quay Lane still exists as a private quay where pleasure craft are moored.

The Public Houses

There have been four public houses in Kirby-le-Soken The Red Lion, The Ship Inn, (formally the White Elm) The Royal Oak (an Ale house) was part of Street House, and the Old Anchor situated where White House and Red House now stand.

Other Buildings and Employment

Set back behind Little House and Waterloo House formally (Wagstaff's Stores) were a group of cottages making up the Work House dating from c.1815 to the 1930's. Oxborrow Engineering Works in Maltling Lane was formally a Slaughter House around 1920, and the building opposite Horsey Road in Halstead Road was also a Slaughter House.

Oxborrow Forge, formally a blacksmiths shop and later an automobile repair garage and Filling Station survived from the 1800s into the early 2000's, two houses now stand on its site.
Over the years Kirby le Soken has had two Filling Stations and Garages, a number of shops, a post office, Apple Orchard opposite Quay Lane, Market Garden in Halstead Road, public houses, carpenter, Agricultural Engineering, Dairy, Upholsterer, Motor Spray Paint Shop, Taxi Co and Agriculture including a Turkey Farm. Kirby Brick Fields employed a number of men digging clay by hand and making bricks by hand, for local use and export, a brick marked Kirby can be found in the brickwork of Low Barn.

The Water Supply

Kirby-le-Soken had its own water supply, piped in 2” wrought iron pipe, from a bricked spring at the top of Victoria Avenue which served seven Stand pipes; these were spread throughout the village. It was installed by Col Blanchard in 1877 and survived until the mid 1990’s about 116 years, when it became too rusty and leaky to continue. Walton folk would come to Kirby for water because it was much softer and sweeter than their own, as did the people living on Horsey Island.

Schooling

There was a National School on the site of Kirby Church Hall but was pulled down in 1901 and a new school built in Upper Kirby / Kirby Cross, which is now a new Academy.

1953 Floods

During the severe sea water floods only three properties were flooded, these were Quay House, Pilots Cottage and Thatched Cottage, there was no loss of life.

Village Growth

During the 1960’s and 1970’s Kirby-le-Soken expanded its population to twice its size, with the building of the Horsey Road Estate. Houses were also built in a number of other areas including the Sparlings, Briarfields, Crabtree and Malting Lane.
5. CONSULTATION PROCESS & METHODOLOGY

Production of this plan has been overseen by the Village Preservation Society, and its creation was prompted by Councillor Robert Bucke and the Rural Community Council of Essex (RCCE). After some initial preparatory work in 2013 Victoria Burgoyne, a member of the Village Preservation Society, was appointed to lead a sub-committee to complete the process. The sub-committee continued to take advice from the wider membership of the Village Preservation Society.

The major piece of data collection was the questionnaire distributed to all 687 households within the village. This was prepared by the sub-committee, with input from members of the Village Preservation Society, the public, and relevant local stakeholders. The survey was delivered in January 2014, with returns received by the end of February 2014. Completed questionnaires were placed in boxes in the Village Shop and The Ship. Raffle prizes were donated by the Village Preservation Society, Silvertone’s and the Ship Inn to incentivise returns, with the draw being made at the May 2014 Kirby le Soken, Village Preservation Society AGM.

Input of the survey results and data analysis were carried out during 2014, with a view to holding a public presentation of the conclusions to give residents a further opportunity to contribute views to the process. This took place in the Church Hall on 31st January 2015. It is thought approx. 200-250 villagers attended the exhibition.

Following further analysis of the feedback, the final report was prepared by the sub-committee during Summer 2015.
6. RESULTS OF THE CONSULTATION

This section gives an overview of residents' views determined through the survey conducted at the beginning of 2014, and the feedback given at public display in January 2015. Surveys were delivered to all 687 households within the village, with responses received from 167 households, containing 312 residents. Approximately 200 residents attended the feedback session in January 2015.

5.1 Demography and profile of respondents

Those responding represented all age groups (Figure 1.1). The majority of people in the survey were older, with two thirds (64%) of respondents over the age of 60.

Figure 1.1 Demography

![Age of respondents chart]

Figure 1.2 Employment

Figure 1.2 shows the employment status of respondents. More than half of adults surveyed were retired; 31% were in work and 8% in education. The majority (57%) of those in work held jobs within 10 miles of the village, with the remainder commuting further afield (although few as far as London). A third of those in work were self-employed.
The biggest factor attracting residents to Kirby-le-Soken is the appeal of the village itself; the look of the village, life within it and the pleasant surroundings were more important than factors such as employment or proximity to the coast. Almost a third of respondents have lived in the village over 25 years, with most having been in the village at least 6 years.

5.2 Transport and traffic

Kirby-Le-Soken sits between Walton-On-The-Naze, Kirby Cross and Thorpe-Le-Soken. There are three entrances by road to the village. Walton Road is the approach from the east, Halstead Road is the southern entrance to the village from Kirby Cross and the third entry to the village is along The Street to the west, the Thorpe-le-Soken end.

Nearly all (94% of respondents) of Kirby-le-Soken’s residents rely on cars as their primary means of travel. A small number of residents expressed concern about the lack of viable transport alternatives for the area, and in particular a desire to see improved local bus services. More regular services on the Clacton-Walton route, and direct routes introduced to Thorpe-le-Soken and into Frinton-on-Sea. Concerns were also raised about the unadopted road surfaces, in Vista, Edith Road and Victoria Avenue particularly.

Figure 1.3 Halstead road bus stop

However, the management of traffic through the village was identified as a major challenge within the survey. Many residents expressed concern about the volume of through-traffic during the day and the capacity of the village to cope with HGV movements. Residents overwhelmingly agreed on the need for more action to stop cars speeding through the village, particularly late at night. A number of danger spots were identified – including the western/Thorpe End entrance to the village, the turning into St Michael’s Church, Maltings Lane, and the corner leading to Turpin’s Barn and Turpin’s Farm cottage.

Figure 1.4 Thorpe end entrance

A lower speed limit received strong support, rather than more aggressive measures such as speed cameras.
5.3 Village Life and the Environment

The third section of the survey sought views on the local environment, facilities the village has to offer, as well as the look and feel of the village.

The survey revealed that there is a strong sense of community spirit – residents are typically proud of the area they live in, and want to contribute to it. Nearly half of respondents indicating willingness to give time (47%) or money (52%) to support the village. Existing events such as the fete are widely enjoyed, and almost half of residents supported the idea of more community activities, such as a May Day celebration, open air concert or village walks.

Protecting the village environment is essential to respondents. The coastal protection strip, the conservation area, the agricultural land surrounding the village and ensuring the village is kept detached from surrounding areas were all hugely important to respondents. Just over a quarter of households thought that the conservation area should be extended. Further environmental measures received a mixed reception, with strong opposition to initiatives that could change the character of the village such as wind farms.
Residents supported efforts to increase the greenery of the village, and improved standards of cleanliness through more litter and dog waste bins and better upkeep of verges and hedges.

Figure 1.6 Are There Enough...

5.4 Local Services, Facilities and Security

The village shop, pubs, churches and Maltings Lane recycling facility are all used by significant numbers of residents.

Residents are satisfied with the quality of most local services, including water, electricity, telephones and refuse collection. However, concerns were raised in a number of categories - broadband, verge maintenance and roadside cleanliness were each rated as poor by around 40 people.

The Doctors surgery in Walton was also highlighted as a significant concern. 62 people ranked the service as ‘poor’, compared to just 19 rating it as ‘good’. A desire for improvement was evident in more than one section of the survey.
Nearly all respondents supported keeping the existing recycling facility at Malting Lane.

While facilities within the village are widely used, respondents wanted to see more recreational space: further benches, a children’s play area and picnic area all received support, as well as cycle paths.

A question on street lighting, answered before recent changes, revealed around half of respondents favouring the status quo, with a third backing the restriction of lighting past midnight.

By far, the biggest anti-social concern was cars speeding through the village late at night (see 5.2 above). However, there is broad-based support for more visible policing measures such as a village constable or neighbourhood watch schemes.

5.5 Local Government, Planning and Development

A majority of households in all age brackets felt under informed about the actions and activities of the Town, District and County Councils, and in particular that insufficient publicity is given to planning applications that affect the village.

Figure 1.7 Do You Think Kirby-Le-Soken Can Accommodate new housing? (Left)

77% of respondents think Kirby-Le-Soken cannot accommodate new housing, and a range of potential developments proposed in the survey were met with concern. If new houses were to be built or existing properties extended, a strong majority felt they should be built in a traditional style in keeping with the rural character and surrounding buildings.

A recurrent concern was that future planning decisions may threaten the identity of the village, by eroding the boundary between Kirby-Le-Soken and Kirby Cross, or in the direction of Frinton and Walton. Others questioned the ability of local infrastructure to cope with new development, particularly in areas such as health where there is already concern as to sufficient local provision (see 5.4 above).

Figure 1.8 The Village (Right)
5.6 Young people

Many residents were concerned to ensure that the village retains strong appeal to all ages, but it was widely acknowledged that there are limited facilities for the younger population.

A range of ideas were put forward, including new clubs and social activities to ensure that young people from across the village were able to make friends locally, and the suggestion that better use could be made of recreational space within the village, such as the Kirby playing fields near the tennis club.

As detailed in the action plan, more work needs to be done to assess what initiatives might be beneficial for young people, and how this could be delivered.
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### 8. APPENDICES

#### Appendix 1 - Detailed Survey Results

Total number of surveys delivered 687. 167 Households replied, containing 312 people who responded to the survey. All questions required an answer per household member unless otherwise stated.

#### 1. Personal Section

1.1 Gender

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Your age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81+</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 How long have you lived in Kirby le Soken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under a year</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 15 years</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 25 years</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 50 years</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of my life</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Where did you live before

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from Kirby le Soken</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 1-11 miles of Kirby le Soken</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 11 – 30 miles of Kirby le Soken</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30 miles of Kirby le Soken</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5 Why did you choose to live in Kirby le Soken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born here</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in the Area</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives in the area</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity of employment</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village life</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Came with parents</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the look of the village</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6 What to you is the most important thing about Kirby le Soken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The village community</th>
<th>65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The surroundings and environment</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to the sea</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to the Walton Backwaters</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to employment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Church of St Michael’s Building</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Church Community</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 Are you at present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An employee or contractor</th>
<th>64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In full time education</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwaged partner</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term sick</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered disabled</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under school age</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid / voluntary Worker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8 Where is your main place of paid work (where applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the Village</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 10 miles of Kirby le Soken</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 20 miles of Kirby le Soken</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within over 20 miles of Kirby le Soken</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Transport & Traffic

2.1 What mode of transport do you own

| Car | 145 |
| Motorbike | 5 |
| Cycle | 4 |

2.2 If appropriate, what is your main means of transport to work, training or study (tick one only)?

| Car / Van | 91 |
| Bicycle | 3 |
| Bus | 2 |
| Motorcycle | 2 |
| Coach | 2 |
| Train | 2 |
| Walking | 4 |
2.3 What is your main/preferred means of transport for other journeys (tick one answer only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Transport</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car / Van</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Would you use the bus and or train if:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More routes</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More frequent services</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular evening services</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost less</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better disabled access</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closer to your home</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 Are you concerned about:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The speed of traffic through the village</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The volume of traffic through the village</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of Heavy Goods Vehicles through the village</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Would you support any of the following in the village?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed bumps</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a lower speed limit</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of the speed limit</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking restrictions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed cameras</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More speed reactive illuminated signs</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 Do you have difficulty in getting to any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospital – Clacton</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital – Colchester</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8 Do you feel there are any danger spots in the village?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danger Spot</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrance to St Michaels Church</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance to the village at the Thorpe le Soken end</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to the Recycling centre in Malting Lane</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Environment and Local Area

3.1 Would you like to see any of the following in the village?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Area</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelican Crossings</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle paths through the village</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini roundabout at the bottom of Halstead Road</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Should the following be encouraged in the village?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Jobs</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business development</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small scale industrial workshops</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Shops</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Restaurants</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take away food outlets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors Surgery</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More sports facilities</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better access to the Backwaters</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s playground / area</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Would you assist with the following initiatives in the village if they were to take place?

- Looking after woods and trees
- Creation of a village pond
- Help clear up litter
- Help to maintain landscaping and planting

3.4 Are there enough in the village?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Litter bins</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Waste Bins</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planted areas</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seats / Benches</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 What is important to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removal of litter</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping verges mown and tidy</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letting verges grow for wildlife</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More footpaths</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less footpaths</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map of local footpaths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More signage</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less signage</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water drainage</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of overhead wires (electricity, telephone)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of road furniture e.g. signs bollards etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 What do you think is important to improve the environment of the village?

- Planting more trees                           | 68         |
- Improved tree maintenance                     | 64         |
3.7 What concerns you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More hedges</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More allotments</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of environmental projects</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recycling centre in Malting Lane</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The allotments in Malting Lane</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise in the village</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy goods vehicles travelling through the village</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing number of large supermarkets in the area</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive lighting from private houses</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive lighting from public lighting</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 Do you use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The village shop</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The village pubs</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any of the churches</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The church hall</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The allotments</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recycling centre</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile library</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9 At present street lights are left on all night would you support any of the following measures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave as now</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More street lighting</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in the number of street lights by 50%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lights to be only on from sunset to midnight</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.10 Would you like to see more village social activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May Day Celebration</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Air Concerts</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Walks</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.11 Do you support / attend any of the following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village Fete</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Air Concert</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirby Woods</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any of the churches</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.12 Would you be prepared to volunteer TIME in support of the village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Yes respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.13 Would you be prepared to donate money in support of the village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Yes respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.14 Would you support the introduction of wind turbines in fields adjacent to the village?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of YES respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.15 Would you support the introduction of other environmentally friendly solutions e.g. solar power?

Number of YES respondents 75

4. Local Services and Facilities

4.1 Please state your views on the standard of the following services over the last 12 months: (1 = good, 2 = reasonable, 3 = poor, 4 = no opinion, 5 = not applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mains water supply</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drains and sewers</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mains electricity supply</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse collection</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lighting</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside care / cleaning</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verge cutting / maintenance</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of items that have been fly tipped</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal delivery</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Service</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadband Service</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Reception</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors Surgery</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Nurse</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Visitor</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity care</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan of medical equipment</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling services</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy services</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital transport</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Do you consider there is sufficient police coverage in the village

Number of YES respondents 59

4.3 Have you experienced any criminal or anti-social issues in the village in the last 5 years? (Please tick more than one if appropriate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House Theft</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from the garden or outbuilding</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mugging</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunkenness</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal drug use</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car theft or damage</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding cars</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late night speeding cars</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Do you think any of the following are needed in order to reduce crime? (Please tick more than
one if appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCTV</th>
<th>34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater police presence</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village special constable</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lighting</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood watch scheme</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Do you think the Recycling Centre should continue to be operated in Malting Lane?
*Shows number of YES respondents* 145

4.6 Do you think the council is doing enough to recycle our waste?
Would you like to see better recycling options 100
Would you like to return to the previous recycling system which was in operation 51

5. Local Government Planning & Development

5.1 Do you feel your elected representatives in local government are sufficiently aware of local concerns and feelings? (shows number of YES respondent’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish Council</th>
<th>86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Council</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Council</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Do you feel you are sufficiently informed about the actions/activities of your elected representatives in local government? (shows number of YES respondent’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish Council</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Council</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Council</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Do you think sufficient publicity is given to planning applications which affect the village? *Shows number of YES respondents* 43

5.4 Would you like to see any of the following developments in the village?

| Starter Homes | 26 |
| Flats         | 5  |
| Housing Association / Rented Accommodation | 9 |
| Small Business Units | 27 |
| More private housing | 17 |
| More infill housing | 13 |

5.5 Do you think that Kirby le Soken can accommodate new housing?
*Shows number of YES respondents* 27

5.6 If new houses were to be built in the village would you like to see them built?

| In a traditional style | 69 |
| In a style compatible with surrounding buildings | 95 |
| In a modern contemporary style | 5 |
| As smaller lower cost houses at higher densities | 2 |
| As larger houses on larger plots | 22 |
5.7 When considering planning applications for extensions to existing properties should planners ensure?

- They are built of any style/material at the owners discretion: 11
- Compatible with the rural character of the village and surrounding properties: 144

5.8 Do you feel that the following features are vital to Kirby le Soken?

- Coastal Protection Strip: 112
- The conservation area: 111
- Do you think the conservation area should be extended (YES respondents): 74
- Detachment from surrounding villages: 108
- Being surrounded by agricultural land: 126
- Village Green: 113
- Maintenance of properties by their owners: 109

5.9 Do you think that the current regulations protect sufficiently the character of the area?

- Shows number of YES respondents: 63

6. Young People

6.1 Do you feel that the village caters for young people? (Number of households stating YES).

- Sufficient Activities: 5
- Clubs and or societies: 2
- Sports Facilities: 3

6.2 Do you think transportation links meet the requirements of young people?

- Number of Households responding YES: 8

7. General

We all have different ideas about the changes we would like to see in Kirby le Soken. Each member of the household is encouraged to suggest the single most important change that they would like to see:

Details of the comments made have been recorded however they were too numerous to include in this document.
Appendix 2 – Action Plan

The action plan will be an evolving document, below are some of the issues, which the committee understand from the respondents that require action. There may be more. What is clear is that moving forward everyone in the village needs to be involved in helping to preserve and maintain the village, in line with the results of the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who / How</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORT AND TRAFFIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of Traffic – look at options for traffic calming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger Spots -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VILLAGE LIFE AND THE ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidiness - Clearing and tidying of pavements, verges and footpaths – to remove overgrown grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste - Clearing and tidying of the village, better upkeep of areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste - Provision of more dog and litter bins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and Plants - look at improving the greenery in the village, all to look at their own properties, and identify potential green improvements</td>
<td>All villagers and residents</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Speak to local landowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Activities – approach village societies to identify how we ensure we continue to develop events in the village</td>
<td>Village Societies / Clubs / Village Website</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Look at how village communication can be improved, use of the website created in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Shop – encourage everyone to use the village shop</td>
<td>All villagers</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Support for Village Projects/Initiatives – investigate the possibility of setting up a fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Projects – look at the possibility of what if anything the village can do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors – talk to the Thorpe Surgery who have just opened a surgery in Kirby Cross about communicating with the village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security – look at the various options for improving security in the village e.g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Watch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste – liaise with council regarding recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government, Planning and Development</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning – improve communication about proposed planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbrella Group for Planning In Tendring</td>
<td>Members of the Village Preservation Society to attend the Umbrella Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Developments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending the Conservation Zone etc. – to provide protection in the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young People</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities for Young People – investigate what is available and whether more is required and improve communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village Identity – explore what is meant and how can it be maintained.</td>
<td>Change names of the Village Preservation Society to Kirby le Soken Society. Set up a website for the village and involve more villagers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Helena Ashby on behalf of Planning Services
Sent: 15 August 2016 14:37
To: Planning Policy Team
Subject: FW: Local plan comments for consultation.

Hello,

Please see the email below.

Thanks

Helena Ashby
Support Assistant, Planning Services

01255 686178 hashby@tendringdc.gov.uk www.tendringdc.gov.uk

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

Speaking with the Planning Service about building work or development? Have you spoken with our Building Control Service too? Our team can help you meet Government-set Building Regulations for the safe design and construction of buildings (including energy efficiency and access requirements). Email them on bcinspections@tendringdc.gov.uk or telephone 01255 686111, or look at our website via the following link Building Control for more information.

Please Note: Any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Tendring District Council. Any such communication is informal and is based exclusively on the information that has been provided. The informal views expressed herein are not binding in any way and the Council will not accept any liability in respect of such communication.

From: Cllr D. Land
Sent: 15 August 2016 13:39
To: Planning Services
Subject: Local plan comments for consultation.

Comments on the proposed Local Plan for Tendring.

Whilst I agree that the area has to take a proportion of development to contribute to the government's overall figures on new builds, I believe that Tendring is at the end of a very 'raw deal'.

Having been a part of the Local Plan Committee since being elected as Thorpe and Beaumont's District Councillor in 2015 I have not been able to support the options that have been put in front of us. The distribution of housing for the neighboring village of Weeley is far too high when other suitable spots could be found.

Weeley is a small village that is served by few shops and public amenities. Development on the scale being proposed would be detrimental to the visual amenity - this being a countrified village set in rural fields, woods and green space.

Traffic as a result of this scale of development would mean hundreds of extra cars spilling out onto the highway (B1033) near the Clacton Bypass, an area which is already saturated at peak commuter movement times. The highway issue as a result of this will have a knock on effect for other connecting towns and villages including Thorpe.
Inaccuracies have crept in with the figures being presented throughout this process which is not a good enough to base to make a sound decision.

I believe that Weeley should be re-visited following on from this consultation period and a more suitable solution put forward for the good of the people and the district as a whole.

Cllr Dan Land
Beaumont and Thorpe
Please find attached a local plan consultation response from Thorpe le Soken Parish Council

Many thanks
Thorpe-Le-Soken Parish Council

Parish Council Clerk
Mrs Shirley Howe

Wednesday, 07 September 2016

Lifeshouse Thorpe – proposal to build 350 residential units.

It has recently been brought to the attention of the Parish Council that Lifeshouse are looking to submit a late application to the local plan. This would include mixed residential, care and holiday units.

Thorpe Hall is steeped in historic and ecological importance.

Thorpe was a prestigious market village with some impressive housing dotted around Thorpe Hall, home to Lord and Lady Byng.

The historic gardens and surrounding parklands of Thorpe Hall are a hidden gem in the heart of Tendring. They are the lasting legacy of the Byngs who contributed so much to the village, something we are very proud of.

There are very few, if any, areas of historic parkland in Tendring, this is one of the few surviving examples. Not only would it be a loss to Thorpe, but the district as a whole, to have this parkland swallowed up by development in the rolling rural countryside.

Examples of wildlife in and around the hall include: slow worms, bats, lizards, mice, voles – the ecology is highly complex and should not be tampered with in any way through development on open land.

The views from Little Clacton across to Thorpe and the hall are picturesque the whole landscape would change forever in terms of the natural beauty and visual amenity.

The Parish Council and the village are strongly against any plans being included in the forthcoming local plan for this site. The gardens and some of the parkland are protected by historic England and any building around this historically important site will do severe harm to the overall setting of the hall of the late Lord and Lady Byng.

Shirley Howe
Dear Sirs,

Please find attached Frinton and Walton Town Council’s submission to the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation Document.

I trust that these comments will be accepted and considered as part of your consultation.

Yours sincerely,

Myrna Liles
Town Clerk
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."

We believe the plan period for all three Districts should be 2016 - 2033 as shown in SP3.

SP3 - Support
SP4 - Vary
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: Tending

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 Tending - 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 mediocre buildings and services, and we will lose the character encouraged by smaller concerns.

**PP10 - Vary** Add Recreational Vehicle Parks

**Reason**
There is great need for specific places for overnight parking for RVs.

**PP11 - Vary** We support this but would ask officers to strengthen the last three paragraphs wherever possible.

**PP12 - Vary**
In objective 2 of “Prosperous Places” we suggested Removing Renewable energy and inserting Tourism and SME’s. The first paragraph of this policy should therefore include reference to these industry training/skill requirements.

Add to the end of last paragraph the words: “and prioritise employment of local people”

**Reason**
to ensure “improving Education and skills” reflects our needs.

**PP13 - Vary** in point c. change “essential” to “key”

**Reason**
Is there another Policy that will allow for individual dwellings of significance to be created from redundant farm buildings?

**PP14 - Support**
Add after Community safety and accessibility, “The B1033 is key to Walton development”

7 Protected Places

In first bullet point of pre-amble, change completely to: “minimising the risk to human life, property and countryside from flooding and coastal erosion.”

**PPL1 - Vary** Remove the Exception test paragraph and 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-
ambles 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.
Good afternoon,

Apologies for sending this via email and not using the consultation portal. Unfortunately it would not let me upload the document.

Please find attached the Wix Parish Council response.

Kind regards,
Emma
Emma Cansdale
Clerk to Wix Parish Council
Tendring District Council Local Plan Consultation

Wix Parish Council Consultation submission.

Wix Parish Council would like to make the following comments in relation to the TDC Local Plan 2013-2033:

Page 83 Policy HP1 d.
d. encouraging healthier communities through targeting of unhealthy lifestyles such as smoking and those which cause obesity as identified in the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment. The Council will work in collaboration with partners, including the primary care trust and local authority environmental health team, to manage the location of fast food takeaways, particularly in deprived communities and local areas of poor health;

This statement contradicts Objective 6 on page 77 which states:
To locate development within Tendring District where it will provide the opportunity for people to satisfy their day-to-day needs for employment, shopping, education, and other services locally or in locations which minimise the need to travel and where there are modes of transport available in addition to the use of car.

In one statement TDC want to minimise the use of cars and in the next they will move fast food outlet developments away from deprived areas - surely this will encourage people to travel further by whatever means for ‘fast food’.

Page 84 section 4.17
4.17 For existing community facilities, the Council will work with its partners to secure future improvements and will protect them against redevelopments for alternative uses, particularly housing. Public houses, in particular, perform a useful social role in rural communities and are a source of local employment. They frequently occupy historic buildings and make a significant contribution to the character of the locality.

This being exactly what TDC failed to do when allowing change of use of The White Hart in Wix. We realise that the policy cannot be applied retrospectively, but this is a rather large, but welcome U-turn in policy!

Page 105-106 Policy LP8 - BACKLAND RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Proposals for the residential development of “backland” sites must comply with the following criteria:
a. where the development would involve the net loss of private amenity space serving an existing dwelling, that dwelling must be left with a sufficient area of private amenity space having regard to the standards in this Local Plan;
b. a safe and convenient means of vehicular and pedestrian access/eGRESS must be provided that does not cause undue disturbance or loss of privacy to neighbouring residents or visual detriment to the street scene. Long or narrow driveways will not be permitted;
c. the proposal must not involve “tandem” development using a shared access;
d. the site must not comprise an awkwardly shaped or fragmented parcel of land likely to be difficult to develop in isolation or involve development which could prejudice a more appropriate comprehensive development solution;
e. the site must not be on the edge of defined settlements and likely to produce a hard urban edge or other form of development out of character in its particular setting; and f. the proposal must not be out of character with the area or set a harmful precedent for other similar forms of development. This Policy contributes towards achieving Objective 1 of this Local Plan.

Section e. The White Hart Development is a backland residential development on the edge of the defined settlement and this development is absolutely what section e of this policy is trying to prevent. How can the development be allowed to go ahead when it contradicts the ideals of the new local plan?

Page 159 Section 8.4 and 8.14 (Connected Places)
Although most journeys are made by car, most are over relatively short distances (sometimes as part of a much longer journey) and could often be made by other, more sustainable, modes of transport. Therefore making good provision within the design of new developments to encourage walking, cycling and public transport use is crucial to achieving sustainable development. Such solutions can have wider public benefits, not only in terms of transportation choices but also for public health and safety, with increased physical activity, well-being and levels of use of public spaces.

Proposals for new development will be required to take account of the need to ensure accessibility, having regard to its location in relation to existing services and facilities, and by providing safe pedestrian and cycle connections to existing networks. As the Tendring District is mainly rural, reliance upon private cars will be inevitable to some extent within its remoter parts. However, the Council will require that measures for sustainable travel at all new developments are investigated and implemented where practicable.

TDC have not said what they are going to do to encourage people out of their cars and onto bikes or their feet. Wix Parish Council suggest a cycle-path and footpath along the A120 from Parkeston to the Hare Green junction on the A120 allowing safer cycling and walking between Parkeston Quay and Colchester. The current provision for cycling between Dovercourt and Colchester is appalling and dangerous. This could be part of the A120 upgrade when it is dualled, but would have the biggest impact if it was done sooner.

Key points:

- Wix Parish Council supports development in urban areas, and agrees the rural communities should not be developed.
- The rural communities across Tendring, with particular reference to Wix, do not have the infrastructure in place to support additional development. There are wider issues with acceptable drainage systems across Tendring (and Colchester), where the Anglin Water systems do not have the capacity to cope with the existing load. Before any further development is carried out, the necessary work must be carried out to ensure adequate drainage infrastructure.
- Surface Water systems must also be reviewed and assurances on adequacy received or improvements made, before any further development takes place.
- Infrastructure—the road network: Wix Parish Council wish to raise concerns over A120 and its capacity. Whilst this is not a TDC function, further development in the Harwich/Dovercourt area, without improving the A120 will create a heavily congested route into the town and Parkeston area. It will also result in dangerous sections of the road. The junctions at Colchester Rd Wix, Hanwich Rd Wix, Primrose Lane and Rectory Road are particular concerns. Additional traffic in the Dovercourt area will have a knock-on effect through the local rural areas if the strategic route is not improved.
- Wix Parish Council strongly supports Section 4.17 on page 84.
- Wix Parish Council supports Policy LP6 - Backland Residential Development
- Wix Parish Council supports Policy LP5 - Affordable and Council Housing
- Wix Parish Council suggests TDC encourage further development of dedicated cycle infrastructure throughout the district.

In conclusion, Wix Parish Council supports this draft plan in principle, and have no objections to the plan directly relating to Wix. However, WPC would like the comments raised to be investigated.
To whom it may concern,

Please see the below response to the Local Plan Consultation.

It is important that the rural nature of villages in the Tendring area is maintained.

In an effort to build more homes in Tendring consideration has been given in the Plan to a large conurbation in the Weeley area however, many of the roads serving this district are running at capacity. At government level perhaps more attention should be given to considering the building of new towns linked by the motorway system to London or Manchester as districts such as Tendring have limited employment prospects.
Some development is vital however it should be proportionate and in keeping with the rural character of the general area.

Many thanks

Michelle Salazar
Parish Clerk
on behalf of Alresford Parish Council

Alresford Parish Council Office, The Pavilion, Ford Lane, Alresford, Essex, CO7 3AT
Tel: 01206 615117 Email: alresfordpc@outlook.com
Website: http://www.essexinfo.net/alresford/
From: Cause Campaign <stopurbansprawlnow@gmail.com>  
Sent: 07 September 2016 07:44  
To: Planning,policy  
Cc:  
Subject: District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document" PART 2  
Attachments: TendringPreferredOptionPart2CAUSEresponse7Sep2016.pdf

Dear Sir or Madam,

Please find attached a response from CAUSE to Part 2 of Tendring's Preferred Options. Part 1 will be submitted to Colchester.

Kind regards
Rosie Pearson
Secretary

CAUSE (Campaign Against Urban Sprawl in Essex)
Website: http://www.cause4livingessex.com/

Twitter: https://twitter.com/120cause

Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/StopGateway120
Dear Sir or Madam

Response to Tendring Preferred Options Part 2 2016

CAUSE welcomes the chance to respond to Tendring’s Preferred Options Part 2. We will submit a full response to the North Essex Authorities Strategic Part 1 for Local Plans by Colchester’s consultation deadline.

CAUSE has put forward a transit-oriented development proposal for Colchester and Tendring. This ‘Colchester Metro Plan’ is a sustainable development plan based around the under-utilised public transport spine of the Colchester-Clacton railway. CAUSE’s plan meets the requirements of the Tendring’s Local Plan policies (which follow from the NPPF). We address each of these in this response.

Overview of Colchester Metro Plan proposal:

CAUSE’s proposal takes advantage of employment and infrastructure opportunities to the east of Colchester and across Tendring District. It provides a network of integrated, sustainable, garden communities, benefiting the economies of both Colchester and Tendring. Settlements along the under-used resource of the Colchester-Clacton electrified railway, and one as proposed by Colchester and Tendring near the University, could provide up to 19,000 homes. All would be within a 10 minute walking catchment of high quality transport and deliverable within the 15 year plan period. Early implementation would be possible without waiting for major infrastructure, thus removing delivery and viability risk. Each settlement would offer low order services and the 15 minute rail service would connect residents to high orders services in the towns. The concept is more in line with the original garden city vision than freestanding large settlements.

The map below demonstrates how CAUSE’s Colchester Metro Plan fits with Tendring’s Preferred Options:
Our detailed response is below.

Yours faithfully

Rosie Pearson
Secretary, CAUSE

Campaign Against Urban Sprawl in Essex: a company limited by guarantee, registered in England, Co. no. 09684557. Registered office: Abbey Mill House, Coggeshall, Colchester, Essex CO6 1RD
## Tendring Preferred Options & NPPF Policies

**Tendring’s Local Plan vision states:** “To locate development where it will provide the opportunity for people to satisfy their day-to-day needs for employment, shopping, education and other services locally or in locations which minimise the need to travel and where there are modes of transport available in addition to the use of the car.”

---

## How CAUSE’s ‘Colchester Metro Plan’ proposal meets Tendring’s policy requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>CAUSE’s ‘Colchester Metro Plan’ proposal meets Tendring’s policy requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1 ‘Support Tendring’s growth locations: Harwich, Clacton and West of Colchester’</td>
<td>“Colchester Metro Plan” (Colchester Metro Plan) settlements are self-contained for low level services and connected by public transport (train) within walking distance of all homes to high order services in other locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5 ‘Facilitate population growth where it supports economic objectives’</td>
<td>Colchester Metro Plan creates a public transport spine offering a Metro-style train service to connect the east of Tendring district with the west and providing a public transport option for the westward flow of labour movement daily. Population growth along the Colchester-Clacton line should be facilitated because it supports economic objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

| The Aspinall Verdi Employment Study suggests that sites to the West of Tendring (garden Village) score well given their communication linkages and proximity to Colchester. The study states that due to the closeness of West Tendring to Essex |

---

**Infrastructure First**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>University, this area can provide a competitive advantage and deliver medium to long term employment opportunities for Tendring District.</strong> (100ha employment land will be negotiated)</th>
<th><strong>station at the University and provides for up to 10,000 homes in the West of Tendring/East of Colchester area.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weeley also scores well given that it forms part of a relatively large settlement with good communication linkages and the presence of uses such as the hotel and service area. Similarly, the Oakwood Extension site in Clacton presents an opportunity to extend the already functioning and popular Gorse Lane Industrial Estate.</td>
<td>More emphasis should be given to the excellent public transport linkages offered by the Colchester-Clacton rail line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hartley Gardens site also scores highly due to its location directly off the A133 and its ability to provide further employment land to the edge of Clacton. (10ha employment land will be negotiated)</td>
<td>Hartley Gardens site could fit into Colchester Metro Plan’s as an additional garden community connected to Colchester by the Colchester-Clacton rail line, thus providing further critical mass of population to support the viability of the service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY PP14: PRIORITY AREAS FOR REGENERATION**

| The Council will support proposals for new development which are consistent with achieving its regeneration aims | **CAUSE’s Colchester Metro Plan proposal enables the priority areas of Clacton and Walton-on-the-Naze to connect by a 4 x hourly metro train service with the employment hubs of the University and Colchester town centre. As such it is consistent with the Council’s regeneration aims.** |

| **8.1 Sustainable Transport and Accessibility** | Tendring’s Preferred Options are heavily road-based. The NPPF and Essex’s Transport Strategy both require the transport system to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes. CAUSE’s Colchester Metro Plan proposal does just that. It is a transit-oriented development solution which, in the communities |

Campaign Against Urban Sprawl in Essex: a company limited by guarantee, registered in England, Co. no. 09664357. Registered office: Abbey Mill House, Coggeshall, Colchester, Essex CO6 1RD
The 'Haven Gateway'. It sets out the transport priorities for the area, which include 5 key outcomes to be achieved:

1. Provide connectivity for Essex communities and international gateways to support sustainable economic growth and regeneration;

5. Provide sustainable access and travel choice for Essex residents to help create sustainable communities.

The Council will support and encourage measures which will make rail use a more attractive and sustainable alternative to the use of private cars for both local journeys and longer commutes and to the use of HGVs for freight transportation.

**POLICY CP1: SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

Proposals for new development must be sustainable in terms of transport and accessibility and therefore should include and encourage opportunities for access to sustainable modes of transport, including walking, cycling and public transport.

Major growth areas in West Tendring / East Colchester and Clacton will require new strategic highway infrastructure, which will not only serve the development areas themselves but also provide for two major new roads, to ensure that traffic is able to move through and between settlements efficiently, thereby preventing traffic congestion which would otherwise occur. These two new roads will be between the A120 and A33 and at west Clacton between the A133 and B1027.

**8.1 Sustainable Transport and Accessibility**

They themselves, encourages 'active transport', with no housing being further than 800m from public transport and, externally, makes use of an existing under-utilised transport system to provide a metro service, thus encouraging a shift from personal car use, currently very high in the District.

CAUSE's Colchester Metro Plan proposal is strategically based around sustainable transport.

The Council must therefore devote resources into working with developers and Network Rail to maximise the use of the Colchester-Clacton rail line. It provides an attractive and sustainable alternative to car use.

CAUSE's Colchester Metro Plans proposal is sustainable in terms of transport and accessibility. It encourages a shift from driving to walking, cycling and public transport.

We support the need for these new roads.
Cycling and walking should also be seen as transport modes in their own right and an integral part of the transport network.

CAUSE’s Colchester Metro Plan settlements are designed to be compact, walkable and cycleable, with no home more than 800m from public transport.

8 CONNECTED PLACES

The Local Plan’s strategic objectives for infrastructure Provision are “To make efficient use of existing transport infrastructure and ensure sustainable transport opportunities are promoted in all new development. Where additional capacity is required in the form of new or upgraded transport infrastructure, to ensure this is provided alongside new development.” and “To ensure that new growth brings opportunities to enhance existing services, facilities and infrastructure for the benefit of existing and new communities.”

Tendring’s policies are focused upon:
- protecting the main strategic roads in the district and improving these roads where the opportunity/need arises;
- supporting proposals which will enhance the strategic transport network;
- encouraging travel by sustainable modes of transport;
- promoting improved access to, and facilities for, public transport; and
- further developing the provision of higher speed broadband services.

...making good provision within the design of new developments to encourage walking, cycling and public transport use is crucial to achieving sustainable development.

Given the strategic objective to ‘make efficient use of existing infrastructure’ it is essential that the Council should focus on the green transport opportunities offered by the Colchester Clacton rail line.

Growth along the Colchester Clacton line brings opportunities to enhance existing services, facilities and infrastructure for the benefit of existing and new communities. CAUSE’s Colchester Metro Plan proposal must be looked at seriously.

Tendring Council has not supported CAUSE’s Colchester Metro Plans proposal despite the fact that it meets the policy requirements. It ‘enhances the strategic transport network, encourages travel by sustainable modes of transport, and promotes improved access to, and facilities for, public transport’. Our proposal addresses the high car dependency in the District and provides a solution which would encourage a modal shift to active modes and to train travel.

As stated above, the design of CAUSE’s Colchester Metro Plan encourages walking, cycling and public transport use.

Campaign Against Urban Sprawl in Essex: a company limited by guarantee, registered in England, Co. no. 09684557. Registered office: Abbey Mill House, Coggeshall, Colchester, Essex CO6 1RD.
### POLICY CP2: IMPROVING THE TRANSPORT NETWORK

- Proposals for new development which contribute to the provision of a safe efficient transport network that offers a range of transport choices will be supported.

### DELIVERING INFRASTRUCTURE

Tendring – Infrastructure Delivery Plan

CAUSE wishes to understand why Tendring Council has not supported a proposal which does just this.

We question why Network Rail is not listed as one of the organisations to be involved in the implementation of this Local Plan. Sustainable transport has been highlighted as a priority and the Colchester-Clacton line provides an opportunity to create a frequent and regular metro service. It is clear that the Council is not pursuing this opportunity and we ask why not.

### POLICY CP1: SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Proposals for new development must be sustainable in terms of transport and accessibility and therefore should include and encourage opportunities for access to sustainable modes of transport, including walking, cycling and public transport.

As stated above, CAUSE’s Colchester Metro Plan does just that. Our proposals should be considered and included in the Local Plan.
From: Weeley Parish Council <weeleypc@gmail.com>
Sent: 07 September 2016 11:11
To: Planning policy
Cc: Catherine Bicknell; Simon Meecham
Subject: Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document
Attachments: Local Plan consultation response from Weeley Parish Council.docx

Please find attached the consultation response on the Local Plan Preferred Options document from Weeley Parish Council.

Nicola Baker
Clerk to Weeley Parish Council
Tendring District Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation Document; response from Weeley Parish Council

In August 2015 Weeley Parish Council summarised its general view on the Issues and Options Document thus:

"WPC recognises that new houses are needed in the district, and is also cognisant of the pressure on district councils to satisfy government targets. However, it is a concern that this consultation may be merely a paper exercise for officers; the impact on the quality of life for residents is significant. The wrong decisions will be felt for generations to come when officers and politicians have moved on."

Sadly, despite the active encouragement of TDC officers to submit comments on the "big issues facing our district" and the resulting avalanche of negative responses from many local people and the Parish Council there has been no sign that consultees’ responses have had any impact whatsoever on the Draft Local Plan. Therefore Weeley Parish Council is forced to conclude that the concern expressed in August 2015 that the consultation is merely a paper exercise has been confirmed.

It is clear that TDC has decided that Weeley will bear the brunt of new development for the area and will therefore change beyond all recognition despite the valiant attempts of local people to retain the rural feel of a much-loved community.

Should the Draft Local Plan be adopted in its current form, Weeley Parish Council feels that it would be appropriate to challenge TDC’s decision-making process by means of a judicial review. Sadly, resources preclude this course of action.

Despite the futility of submitting a response at this stage of the so-called ‘consultation’, Weeley Parish Council nonetheless makes the following points:

- We are asked to reference each paragraph number on which we are commenting and to “provide alternative wording which you consider would remove your objection.” This suggests that the outcome of the consultation will be minor tweaks only. Where is the option for fundamental objection to the proposals?

- Weeley (including Weeley Heath, which is not a separate community) is essentially a rural village with very few local services. It is home to a higher than average number of over 65s - 25.9%, as compared to an Essex figure of 18.3% and an England figure of 16.3%. This gives it a high dependency ratio (ie, the ratio of non-working age to working age people) of 0.76, England average = 0.55.¹

- There is no objective assessment of Weeley’s suitability for significant additional growth; it is more a case of the availability of land offered by local landowners
keen to ensure their family fortunes – an easy solution to a district wide problem. Does TDC feel that it is easier to decimate one small community than spread the load equally? Luckily for TDC the age profile of Weeley is such that natural wastage will remove a significant number of objectors over the next few years! 30.5% of households in Weeley are pensioner households compared to an England average of 20.7%.

- There is very little mention of Weeley in the document; it does not feature in 1.5 Spatial Portrait – list of towns and secondary settlements. In fact, 1.5.2 states that “Beyond these settlements much of the area has a rural character” and 1.5.9 states that “due to the extensive rural area outside settlements, agriculture plays an important part in the overall economy”. It would not seem to be important to TDC that the rural nature of Weeley is preserved and the loss of prime agricultural land would seem to be irrelevant.

- In Chapter 6, Prosperous Places, Weeley does not feature in the retail hierarchy nor is it a ‘priority area for regeneration’ (PP 14)

- The infrastructure in Weeley is already under strain. There is no GP surgery; and the road distance to a GP is 4.2km, significantly higher than the England average of 1.2km. This is particularly worrying as the number of people with a limiting long term health condition in Weeley (all ages) is 25.4%, and steadily climbing. The Essex figure is 17.1%; England is 17.6% Despite this, in section 1.20.2 which highlights the need for more and better healthcare facilities across the region, only Witham is identified by name! For Weeley residents, the average travel time to the nearest hospital by public transport/walking is 92 minutes; the County average is 46 minutes.

- Section 1.6.2 states that “the aging profile of residents also requires a proactive response ................ as well as sufficient healthcare facilities to support both older residents and the population as a whole.” Policy SP4 states that “Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development”. There is no evidence that there are any plans in place to follow through on this objective in Weeley.

- The primary school is full and there is no secondary school; distance to secondary school 8.7km, England average 2.1km.

- Public transport links are poor and there is therefore a high reliance on cars – in Weeley, 15% of households have no car; the figure for Essex is 18% and England 25.8%.

- There are minimal local employment opportunities for working people in Weeley. There is a significant disparity in the percentage of people who travel less than 2km to work: in Weeley the percentage is 9.7, whereas the Essex figure is 17.8%. Section 1.10.7 states “The Objectively Assessed Housing Need Survey and Strategic Housing Market Assessment update seeks to establish a balance between jobs and homes across the area, although there is some uncertainty in
relation to this arising from unattributed population change within Tendring." How does the proposed increase in population for Weeley in any way seek to match homes with jobs?

- The Housing Market Area includes Chelmsford. How can reasonable assumptions be made across such a disparate area? (1.10.3)

- Skill levels in the local population can be an important driver of community sustainability. 34.5%, of people in Weeley have no qualifications; the Essex figure is 23.9% and the England figure is 22.5%.

- TDC decided at its Local Plan meeting in April 2016 that, if 550 new homes per annum are required across the district, Weeley will take 304. However, if 600 new homes per annum are required, Weeley will take 1411; no other community will see an increase in numbers. Listening to the recorded minutes of the LP committee in April and reading the published minutes, there is no sensible explanation to the question asked by the Chair of Weeley Parish Council. In fact, it is clear that there is a lack of understanding by members! This is not the way to take decisions which will have such a significant impact on the local community of Weeley.

---

1 Source: Census 2011
2 Source: Census 2011
3 Source: Commission for Rural Communities 2010
4 Source: Census 2011
5 Source: Census 2011
6 Source: Department for Transport, 2011
To whom it may concern,

Please see the below response from Frating Parish Council regarding the above.

Frating Parish Council fully supports the new Local Plan as we believe it is very important for TDC to have a new plan in place so that planning in Tendring is controlled by the Council and local residents and not by landowners and developers.

Although there are areas of the plan where we believe there will be a high level of resistance, in particular from those villages which have been earmarked for a large amount of housing, we feel that in the most part those villages do have the facilities, shops, schools, doctors and transport links (roads/trains) that can be expanded to cater for that extra amount of housing.

We believe that it is important that before the house building commences on any of these large developments, the infrastructure is improved as far as is feasible rather than at the later stages of development.

At an earlier stage of the plan, again "Tendring Central" was put forward as a possible option. We are very pleased that TDC agrees with Frating and has concluded that this would not be a sustainable development. As you are aware, this site has been proposed in one form or another for development on at least two previous occasions and each time has been rejected by the Planning Inspectorate as not sustainable. We strongly believe that had TDC included "Tendring Central" in the plan then again the whole plan would have been rejected by the Planning Inspectorate and all the hard work of the TDC Planners would have been in vain.

Many thanks

Michelle Salazar
Frating Parish Clerk
on behalf of Frating Parish Council

email: fratingpc@hotmail.com
From: Richard Colley <richard.c.colley@btinternet.com>
Sent: 02 September 2016 14:45
To: Planning,policy
Subject: Tendring District Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation (2016) - Wrabness Parish Council

Dear Planning Policy Manager

Please find attached the written representations of Wrabness Parish Council on the Tendring Local Plan Preferred Options document which we request are taken into account.

Regards

Richard Colley
Vice Chairman Wrabness Parish Council
Dear Planning Policy Manager

Tendring District Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation (2016)

Thank you for consulting the Parish Council about the Preferred Options for the Tendring District Local Plan.

The Parish Council held a special meeting to discuss this on 15th August 2016 and resolved to make the following representations relating to Local Map C.33 Wrabness:

**Settlement Development Boundary:**
Object to the mapping. The boundary of the extended Wrabness settlement area reflects the recent decision of TDC Planning Committee to grant outline planning permission (15/01737/OUT) for 18 dwellings and a 0.2 acre village green adjacent to the Wrabness Village Hall. As such the Map should seek to safeguard a site of 0.2 ha immediately to west of Village Hall as proposed local green space. Currently the Map implies the entire extended settlement area is available for residential estate development.

**Safeguarded Local Green Space:**
Support the inclusion of the Rectory Road Playing Field within this policy as currently mapped.

Object to the proposed designation of the railway cutting to the north of Station Road as Safeguarded Local Green Space. This railway cutting is steeply sloping operational railway land, inaccessible to the public with no prospect of becoming available as public open space.

Request that 0.2 acres of land immediately west of Wrabness Village Hall is mapped as proposed Safeguarded Local Green Space, to help address the current shortfall of public open space at Wrabness village.

Request that the Station Masters Garden area at Station Road, Wrabness is mapped as Safeguarded Local Green Space. The Garden was provided by the Parish Council as a Millennium Project and has matured into a pleasant formal public garden adjacent to Wrabness Railway
Station enjoyed by residents and visitors alike.

Local Wildlife Site:
We strongly recommend the designation of the Wrabness Station Yard as a local wildlife site is reviewed – the station commuter car park has been extended into the former Station Yard and the adjacent fenced area is in regular use as an operational yard for track and network maintenance.

We should be grateful if you take these representations into account in reviewing the Preferred Options Document.

Yours sincerely

Richard Colley
Vice Chairman
From: Vikki <vikki@littleoakley.info>
Sent: 07 September 2016 10:07
To: Planning.policy
Subject: Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options consultation document
Attachments: REPRESENTATION FORM - PREFERRED OPTIONS LOPC.pdf

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

Vikki Howard
Clerk to Little Oakley Parish Council
Email: vikki@littleoakley.info
Phone: 01255 880514
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><strong>Address:</strong></td>
<td>Agent's address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rectory Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Oakley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postcode:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO12 5JX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Oakley Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1255 880514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:vikki@littleoakley.info">vikki@littleoakley.info</a></td>
<td>Required information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>Yes</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: TENDERING 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>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy SPL3: Sustainable Design</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part of document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VISION & OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 2 Local Plan: Vision for Tendring and Part 2 Local Plan Objectives for the local plan</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>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part of document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 the discussing the document. |

### HEALTHY 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></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>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 tradesmen 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>

**Part of document** | **Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation**
--- | ---
PP6 | PP6 needs to be robustly applied
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'.

PP7 | 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>Policy PPL12: The Avenues Area of Special Character, Frinton-On-Sea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PPL13: The Gardens Area of Special Character, Clacton-On-Sea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PPL14: Ardleigh Reservoir Catchment Area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL15: Safeguarding of Civil Technical Site, North East of Little Clacton/South of Thorpe-Le-Soken</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>PPL1, PPL2, PPL3</td>
<td>Wholeheartedly Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL5 And PPL4</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL6 PPL10</td>
<td>Wholeheartedly Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL11</td>
<td>This is fine in principle. It should be applied in a way that reflects the spirit of the paragraph. There were mixed views on this. Build houses with Solar Panels on roofs, rather than big solar farms was a suggestion</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>
</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.
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 Braitham; A missed opportunity for Clacton. We have already made the case how corridors of land around rail routes, stations and rail 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 easy 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 stabilising sidings 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 has been mooted that the car park site on former “Station Yard” could be used to provide second platform and stabilising sidings for trains, so more trains can start early mornings from Clacton and Walton The Naze.
- Likewise, reinstatement of second track to Harwich Town and stabilising siding 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 stabilising sidings 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 Gt. 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: [email]
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.OBJECTIVE.CO.UK](HTTP://TENDRING CONSULT.OBJECTIVE.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
Policy Planning Manager...
Tendring District Council, Council Offices,
Thorpe Road, Weeley
Clacton-on-Sea Essex CO16 9AJ

Key Objections to the TDC “proposed” Local Plan :-

The TDC local plan proposal STATES that ‘SEA’ (Strategic Environmental Assessment) was ‘required’ by a European Directive?

AS the UK is NOT going to remain within the EU within the lifetime of the proposed plan or even during any adoption, then ‘SEA’ is surely totally redundant & irrelevant?...

TDC must now take into account the seriously flawed & fictitious statistics, as directed by the EU, in order to formulate a NEW plan, thus any such previous assessment will certainly be erroneous & flawed while any such a directive numbers are included.

The ‘SEA’ MUST be replaced with an ACCEPTABLE, REASONABLE & REALISTIC ASSESSMENT for Weeley Village and NOT the Governments horrendous and detrimental suggested assessment figures.

- The above ‘SEA’, if applied, will be detrimental to any true ‘assessment of local environment, social & economic characteristics and priorities’ & all true studies of the area.
- Likewise with HRA (Habitats Regulation Assessment)-also an EU directive) this will also be redundant & irrelevant within the near lifetime of any NEW Local plan, or even before one becomes fully adopted? Habitats will be destroyed.
- There are also several anomalies contained within the Spatial Portrait (2;1) that are detrimental to the WEELEY aspect of the proposed plan, in so much as several alleged “facts” are in fact INCORRECT, Particularly regarding the roads/transport network and railways (economy) within the WEELEY area as that area is QUITE different to others nearby.
- Weeley Village has apparently been selected for development stating that ‘such networks were good’?...e.g. the small railway station is but a HOLT with one train per hour & stopping at all stations. It is at best simply a local shuttle service between villages with NO SUNDAY service at all, it has been suggested that this station is
likely to CLOSE due to very poor patronage? Further, it has minimal & VERY unsecured car parking spaces for maybe 3 to 4 cars. This station does NOT have ticket purchasing facilities at all. The station area is NOT amenable to ANY future ‘modernisation or expansion’ as spare land is not available at all.

- The section of the plan that depicts WEELEY EXPANDED SETTLEMENT FALSELY CLAIMS that WEELEY has ‘Good Transport connections’... It does NOT!
  BOTH main through roads from the coast to Colchester direction (Vice Versa) are usually gridlocked at all peak times (A133/A120) and even worse during holiday ‘changeover’ times - therefore NO new potential commercial enterprise would be viable considering such a POOR transport network... the local rail facility is also at best poor, as described above.

- **2:3 (part 2..) SP2 (Settlement development Boundaries)** This STATES that there is a “general presumption in favour of new development...”? ...Residents here OVERWHELMINGLY reject any such “presumptions”... especially since all previous /most/ “other’s” have proven to be totally flawed & OR are incorrect!

- **Policy (part 2) SP3; Sustainable Design...** The policy STATES that “all new development should make a POSITIVE contribution to the quality of the local environment and protect -or- enhance local character”... the whole reference to the policy is totally detrimental to, and contravenes the interests and the whole ‘well being’ of the entire VILLAGE & its residents.

- **Policy HP1: (Improving Health & Wellbeing)** This proposal is NOT viable and has already proven to severely contradict the policy! Local residents are already and increasingly suffering ill health, stress and torment due to the very thought of this proposal!

- This is not just Mass Over-development it is destroying what is a rural community with a total disregard for the people who already live here.

- NONE of the content under this section is viable, whereby the NHS is currently unable to staff, or finance current limited facilities sufficiently NOW, let alone support new ones where they have already suggested that they will NOT be funding new sites. We do not have a doctor's surgery NOR pharmacy at all in this immediate area and the nearest village surgeries are already FULL and not able to accept more patients.

- **Policy HP2; Community Facilities (Item c) Providing Green Spaces...** it appears that such “green spaces” already exist, yet are soon to be BUILT OVER with no ROOM for any future replication...!!!

- **4:3...Green Infrastructure...** The NPPF also requires a “wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits”... IF adopted, the proposed local plan would be detrimental to and would certainly NOT allow any of this aspect to become viable due to the vast coverage of proposed buildings, road surfaces and other hard surfaces, as proposed, this also concerns many other proposed sites.
Item 4 "Assets of community value": The NPPF para; 70 states that planning policies SHOULD guide against unnecessary loss of ‘VALUED Community Facilities and Services’ this proposal would certainly disregard & override this ‘requirement’ to the total detriment of the local community and in direct contravention of this policies content.

- **Policy 5;4: Housing layout (Garden Cities principle)…**NOT practical and cannot possibly conform to the criteria as stipulated within the proposed document due to lack of required ‘acreage’/space per site. Any such proposal would simply result in the over EXPANSION of the village, thus could NOT be a ‘Garden City’ within the legal context.

- **Policy LP3: Housing Density & Standards…**Cannot comply to the required criteria as outlined within the document, see above 5;4- Such a vast scheme as proposed constitutes GROSS OVERDEVELOPMENT!

- **Policy PP8: Tourism…**already this is both flawed & troublesome, due to the ONLY two major input/exit routes to the whole area already at full capacity with NO scope for real structural improvement. This is especially evident during peak times (work-school times and worse still at holiday change over periods) Hence “good access to the A120/133′ as ‘described’ with the proposal, is at best, farcical and wishful thinking. ANY significant numbers of extra dwellings within WEELEY village, or surrounding areas would prove fatal. ALL local villages, also the coastal area needs either routes to get access to ANYWHERE inland?…smaller feeder roads such as B1441 &B1033 & B1027 are already being used to circumvent these holdups and these (often) small “lanes” are not designed to accommodate the HUGE volumes of traffic already having to use them & where many DANGEROUS situations have already occurred.

- **Policy CP3 “Improving the Transport Network”**: This cannot be achieved given the excessive number of potential EXTRA vehicles that such an overdeveloped area would create in the short, then longer term?

- **Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network. Plainly this has NOT been duly considered?**

- **Also; Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan: Pre-Submission Focused Changes states that developments will only be acceptable if the additional vehicular movements likely to result from the development can be accommodated within the capacity of the existing or improved highway network or would not lead to an unacceptable increase in congestion. Again, this has NOT been considered?**

- **Recent “assessments & surveys” have been poorly advised and poorly carried out, yet ensuing “statistics” have been recorded for use, despite being both irrelevant and**
fatally “inaccurate” and even worse still, “INCOMPLETE”... where severe congestion at some holiday periods has not been included for the purpose!!! ...see above (Tr1 & CP3)

Therefore IT will be most UNSAFE to formulate any new 'Local Plan' based on such horrendously erroneous information...?

Plainly ANY increase in traffic number WILL therefore reach an unmanageable level if the proposed number of dwellings ever became accepted...!

Point 2.16 Traffic congestion constrains the economy and impacts negatively on quality of life by:

Constraining existing economic activity as well as economic growth, by increasing costs to businesses, damaging competitiveness and making it harder for them to access export markets. Businesses regularly consider access to good roads other transport connections as key in making decisions about where to locate.

All leading to a marked deterioration in the experience of road users. For some, particularly those with time-pressured journeys, congestion can cause frustration and stress, as well as inconvenience, reducing the quality of life also constraining job opportunities, as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets and employment area's.

***Traffic congestion constrains the economy and impacts negatively on quality of life, causing more environmental problems, with emissions per vehicle and greater problems of blight and intrusion for people nearby. This is especially true where traffic is routed through small communities or sensitive environmental areas.

- **Policy PPL10: Holiday Parks**... The proposed local plan, if adopted would be grossly detrimental to most of the local “safeguarded sites” i.e. holiday parks considering that such venues are generally the SOLE industry of much of this area. We must **ENCOURAGE & PROMOTE** the local tourism trade... NOT make it impossible and none viable!!

  *The current proposal indicates building right up to existing holiday park boundaries...WHO would choose to take their holiday beside a housing estate or building site...?*

- **Policy PPL1: Development & Flood Risk**...” The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local planning authorities’ to adapt to climate change”....The proposed local plan is seriously detrimental and flawed with regard to this. It would certainly exacerbate existing and future problems that are already a considerable risk. Many local areas already suffer considerable surface flooding, especially if we take into account future changes OR Climate change (**as we ARE required to do***) where heavier and more frequent, future rains are expected... It is well proven that large areas of concrete/tarmac surfaces WILL, and DO, create more flooding and associated risks far higher than current levels, therefore it is surely **UNSAFE** and **UNWISE** to increase the problems that are plainly already there
and unmanaged still. Under such circumstances ‘SuDS’ would be inadequate of course!

- **POLICY PPL5: Water conservation, Drainage and Sewerage:** Local Sewerage problems are already proving unmanageable & unhealthy. Weeley has already had several incidents of overflowing sewerage—raw effluent appearing ABOVE GROUND in fields and other open spaces, including peoples gardens & other properties...therefore ANY further such pressure on this infrastructure would certainly prove CATASTROPHIC and surely detrimental to the health and well being of residents!

- **Rural Economy:** “The ‘open countryside’, as described within the local plan IS recognised” as an important contribution to the local economy with regard to employment. Therefore the proposed Local Plan WILL adversely compromise and become detrimental to local agricultural employment also output for NOW, ALSO FOR THE FUTURE...e.g. The Proposed Plan would plainly be counterproductive - thus highly detrimental to THIS policy.

- **PolicyPP13...Rural Economy:** This policy should “support growth in the local economy not PREVENT it... Much of the proposed plan will require that same “agricultural land’ to become a building site now & FOREVER!

- **Policy CP1 in the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016)** – proposals for new development must be sustainable in terms of transport and accessibility and therefore should include and encourage opportunities for access to sustainable modes of transport, including walking, cycling and public transport.

- **Policy CP2 in the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016)** – Proposals which would have any adverse transport impacts will not be granted planning permission unless these are resolved and the development made acceptable by specific mitigation which are guaranteed to be implemented.

- The proposed developments would be contrary to Paragraph 32 of the NPPF, Policy TR1a, SD8, CP1, CP2 as the developments would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road, these roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. In our opinion it is irresponsible to propose such large scale developments in an area, where the roads are already stretched to beyond capacity, with no likelihood of funding for improvements to become available, as considerable changes would be required to make these roads safer for people to use. This is the current situation before adding a further 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles.

- **Policy PPL3: The Rural Landscape:** much of the existing “Rural Landscape “would change beyond all recognition IF this proposal becomes adopted and would certainly cause IRREVERSIBLE & OVERIDDING HARM to so much of our local
environment, including many old trees and hedgerows/woodland and associated habitat, bridleways footpaths and rural lanes, many of which look to become main entrances & approach roads to many parts of the proposed estates?

CONCLUSION: -
We therefore suggest that OUR Weeley Village is left as a VILLAGE with just its currently acceptable planned local “expansion” as intended, and that the whole “proposed development” could be relocated to HORSELY CROSS where the entire proposed scheme can easily be accommodated.

That suggested area is close to the A120 that could then receive its much needed upgrade to become a dual carriageway. That would improve access routes to the ports, as well as already being a suitable commercial site.

It is also within striking distance of a good main line railway route with excellent services to both London & Norwich mainline stations.

We therefore suggest that Horsley Cross might then become “Horsley Cross Garden Village”.?...being its own entity, thereby ticking all boxes...?
From:
Weeley Residents Association.....
Mr Colin Crane (sec)

Weeley Heath
28th August 2016

Dear Sir

Please accept this letter as my comment on the Preferred Options Consultation Document (POCD). I trust it will be taken into careful account.

**DRAFT LOCAL PLAN COMMENTS**

*Preferred Options Consultation Document (POCD)*

**DOCUMENTS FOR CONSULTATION**

How is the public expected to read and comment on the vast array of documents covering this consultation? In addition to the 238 page report there are 26 supporting documents as well as the two Sustainability Appraisals totalling 412 pages.

I can only comment on those aspects directly affecting where I live — that’s Weeley — and some wider topics I have the time to consider.

**THE EFFECT OF THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION**

About a year ago, 19th August 2015, Parish and Town Councils were invited to comment on the Issues and Options Document. The request from the then Planning Policy Manager said “we are particularly interested in peoples’ and your Council’s views on the big issues facing our district”.

Like other Parish Councils Weeley replied with comprehensive views of its position and the opinion of its residents, its reply included:

> WPC recognises that new houses are needed in the district, and is also cognisant of the pressure on district councils to satisfy government targets. However, it is a concern that this consultation may be merely a paper exercise for officers; the impact on the quality of life for residents is significant. The wrong decisions will be felt for generations to come when officers and politicians have moved on.

Despite representations such as this from the Parish Council as well as similar responses from individual Parish Councillors and Weeley residents on pro-formas, letters to TDC and presentations at all Local Plan Committee meetings, nothing seems to have changed in respect of potential developments in Weeley. Current documents are the same in essence to those previous published.
PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION

And now the people of Tendring are being asked to comment on the Preferred Options Consultation Document.

Consultations periods like this invariable coincide with public holiday periods when people are less likely to put forward a comment. This usually results in a low number of public comments unlike developers and landowners who have the resources to put forward well developed and copious arguments.

I doubt that additional representations made in response to the current Preferred Options Consultation will have any more influence on the District Councillors in general or those on the Local Plan Committee in particular than those previously submitted.

The people of Weeley have been and still are being ignored.

QUESTIONS THAT STILL NEED ANSWERING

Several questions still need answering.

Who decided to consider the Parish of Weeley as two separate settlements designated as Weeley and Weeley Heath? On what basis was this decision made? It seems to me that the only reason for this is the position of the railway line as stated in the reply to my question to the Local Plan Committee of 12th April 2016. Even today there is still no clear reason for choosing this division.

A more important question was also put to the committee on 12 April 2016. This asked for the reasoning between 304 more houses in Weeley if 550 dwellings per annum (dpa) are required and 1411 more houses if 600 dpa are deemed necessary. Followed by the question “How can it be justified that a 9% increase in dpa results in a 364% increase in houses in Weeley? Why is this difference not spread around the District?” The reply in full was “Thank you Mr Dumsday, taking your question as one: Weeley is not part of the 6109 homes listed in Table A2 rows C - Q. This means that the majority of the supply is already spread around the District. The shortfall at 304 would represent less 5% of the supply required in the District.” This answer did not address the reason for “dumping” all the excess of over 1100 properties on Weeley.

It should be pointed out that the last time Weeley Parish Council was directly consulted by TDC about the content of the Local Plan was at a public meeting in September 2014 when the number of houses was increased from 1000 to 1100. Now the number planned for Weeley is 1411 without any further direct contact with the Parish.

A final question relates to the relative weight given to developers and landowners over the residents of the district. In any list they seem to be given preference and seem to be listened to more than residents. One case in point is the meeting of District Councillors with a developer of a large proposal for 800 (originally 1000) houses in Weeley which specifically excluded any representative of the Parish Council. A petition of some 750 people submitted to Tendring District Council took some eight months to be put before the Local Plan Committee. This demonstrates yet another example of the lack of weight given to residents’ opinion.
TRANSPORT

Paragraph 1.5.4 of the POCD states that “The area’s strategic road and rail network is heavily used, particularly given the proximity to and connectivity with London. The principal roads are the A12 and A120, while the A130, A133 and A414 also form important parts of the strategic road network.”

I will therefore only comment on these two aspects of transport which affect Weeley.

Much is made of the fact that Weeley has a railway station. What is not contained in any of the documents relating to the Local Plan is that Weeley station is only accessible from one side. This makes it unsuitable for use by passers by with mobility problems as their only means of crossing the line is by means of a footbridge.

The A133 is designated as the Weeley and Little Clacton bypass and is the major route to and from Clacton. It was designed as a dual carriageway (as shown by the construction of the bridges over) but, for whatever reason (probably a lack of money), it was reduced in width to a single carriageway. In the past year there have been numerous accidents on this road, many involving fatalities. So to increase its use by building numerous houses in its vicinity would be sheer folly.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without mentioning the numerous “sink holes” which have appeared in and around Clacton which has added to congestion in some village roads.

IMPROVING HEALTH AND WELLBEING (Policy HP 1)

Paragraph f. of this policy contains “seeking contributions towards new or enhanced health facilities from developers where new housing development would result in a shortfall or worsening of health provision”. This does not sit well with the current difficulties in providing or maintain local health facilities especially in view of NHS managers reporting a £461 million deficit in the first quarter of the year and that officials have been told to draw up a list of services which are ‘not clinically and financially sustainable’. 

WHAT EFFECT DO THE OPINIONS OF LOCAL PEOPLE HAVE?

The answer is not much in view of what a Senior Planning Inspector of the Government Planning Inspectorate said in November 2013:

- “notwithstanding efforts to take on board residents’ views [the plan] will be rejected.”
- “any arguments that additional housing will exacerbate unemployment and deprivation ..... will not be accepted by an Inspector.”
- “any arguments that additional housing cannot be built because the existing infrastructure will not be able to cope ..... will not be accepted by an Inspector.”

So it seems that whatever local people say, the government will ignore it, so much for localism.
THE AFFECT ON THE LOCAL PLAN OF THE UNITED KINGDOM LEAVING THE EUROPEAN UNION

The European Union regulations are frequently quoted in Local Plan documents but since the people of the UK voted to leave on Thursday 23 June 2016, certain sections of such documents need to be revisited, for example:

- EU Convention on Biological Diversity Definition (POCD; page 175)
- European Union's Habitats Directive (POCD; page 180)
- European (Union) designated sites, classified under the Birds Directive (POCD; page 181)
- "The Council has a statutory requirement to carry out a number of assessments, in accordance with European legislation........" (POCD; page 57)
- Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is required by a European Directive .... (POCD; page 57)
- Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) is a requirement of the European Habitats Directive ... (POCD; page 57)
- European legislation requires the establishment of Special Protection Areas (SPAs) for birds, under the Birds Directive, and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) for other species and habitats, under the Habitats Directive" (POCD; page 147).

In any case EU regulations have not always been adhered to by member states, for example, in 2011 Italy was told it could not ban plastic bags because of EU rules. When Rome introduced the ban anyway from 2013, Brussels rewrote the rules to allow countries to bring in such legislation.

Finally a quote from Neil Stock, Leader of Tendring District Council and Chairman of the Tendring District Local Plan Committee:

"After all, having an unpopular local plan is better than having no plan."

Tell that to the residents of Weeley.

Yours Sincerely

Peter Dumsday
Chairman Weeley Parish Council