I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C-Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) – Section 4.3.6 Air Quality and Noise

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weeley once you build 2000+ houses. We already have to deal with an ever increasing level of traffic through the village, which every morning and evening comes peak times comes to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

The National Policy Statement for National Networks (December 2014) states the following:

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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within reasonable walking distance for some of the developments, the frequency of the bus and rail service is limited and they do not provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable.

In my opinion before anymore developments are carried out within this area, I would think that it is essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies, can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: BLAKE DAVIES

Address: 

Essex, C016 9AJ
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1.637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: RONALD JAMES SUTCLIFFE    Signature: 

Address: [Redacted] Weeley, Essex CO16 [Redacted]
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps -- C30 Map 33 Weeley.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and-in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weele does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified then in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: TREvor WILLIAMS
Address: Weeley, CO16
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

The Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) – Section 4.3.6 Air Quality and Noise

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state, it will inevitably change for Weeley once you build 2000+ houses. We already have to deal with an ever-increasing level of traffic through the village, which every morning and evening comes peak times and merges on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

The National Policy Statement for National Networks (December 2014) states the following:

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 or other transport connections as key in making decisions about where to locate.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within reasonable walking distance for some of the developments, the frequency of the bus and rail service is limited and they do not provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable.

In my opinion before any more developments are carried out within this area, I would think that it is essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies, can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: TREVOR WILLIAMS
Address: [Redacted] Weeley, CO16
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 6700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District's increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified. Then in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historically beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:
- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres: and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport. the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified? When in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: CLARE KING
Address: Weeley, Colchester, CO6
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: Dorothy Smith
Address: Weeley, Essex, CO16

Signature: [Redacted]
I object to the proposals for Weele as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weele.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weele is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weele does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weele.

On page 27 you indicate that Weele has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weele; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weele but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weele Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weele</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weele Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs. It would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: [Redacted]  Signature: [Redacted]

Address: [Redacted]  Weeley, Essex CO16 [Redacted]
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

For the following reasons as explained in conjunction with the relevant paragraphs:

The Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government
March 2016

Page 7 – Eligibility criteria

12. To be considered for government support under this section of the prospectus, proposals for a new garden village must meet the following criteria:

SIZE

13. For the purposes of this prospectus, we are defining garden villages, to include proposals that are not eligible under our existing offer, which is restricted to new towns and cities of over 10,000 homes. Therefore, to be eligible under this section of the prospectus, proposals must be for a new settlement of 1,500 – 10,000 homes.

Free-standing settlement

14. The garden village must be a new discrete settlement, and not an extension of an existing town or village. This does not exclude proposals where there are already a few existing homes.

Local leadership and community support

17. New garden villages should have the backing of the local authorities in which they are situated. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate a strong local commitment to delivery. They should also set how the local community is being, or will be, engaged at an early stage, and strategies for community involvement to help ensure local support.

Page 8

Local demand

21. It is important that new garden villages are built as a response to meeting housing needs locally. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate how the new settlement is part of a wider strategy to secure the delivery of new homes to meet assessed needs.

Page 9

Infrastructure

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.

The developments proposed for Weeley whilst all together they may amount to new homes in the region of 1,500 to 2,000, they cannot be considered as a new Garden Village as set by the The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government – March 2016. For the following reasons:
1. The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities clearly states that for a new village to be considered it must adhere to **Point 13 Size**, which states that in order to be considered as a Garden Village the minimum number of homes required to fulfil this requirement is 1,500 and not 800 to 1,100 as discussed by the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) and previous versions of the Local Plan in land allocated south of the railway line running along beside the Weeley Bridge Caravan Leisure Park and up to the Bowling Green Roundabout.

2. The area designated for the development of this new village cannot in my opinion be considered to be far enough away from the current village of Weeley to be fulfilling the requirement of **Point 14 Free-standing settlement**, due to its close proximity to houses on the opposite side of the B1441 Clacton Road and Weeley By-Pass. I do not classify a space that is equal to approximately 100 metres as qualifying as being considered sufficient to enable for this development to be called a Free-standing Settlement contrary to what is the government’s requirements.

3. In my opinion the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) does not lend itself to assisting the community in being able to be involved, as the document provides no actual information as to the amount of development proposed for the designated sites and fails to engage the reader, or assist them in being able to express an honest response to the document. It has been written purely for the benefit of the Local Council and Planning Committee without any real consideration for the general public.

4. **Page 8 - Local demand**

Whilst there may be a requirement for new homes as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and also in Policy SP1 in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016), which promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development that performs an economic, social and environmental role.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley are clearly not required by the residents of Weeley and that contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village which dates back to the Doomsday Book.

The level of development that is being proposed for a village with less than 500 houses would result in an increase in the size of the village in the region of 300%, I do not know how this kind of increase can be deemed as acceptable. For what is a rural settlement the scale of development proposed is in my opinion considerably too large to represent a sustainable, fair and proportionate increase in housing stock and would conflict with, and undermine, the core planning principle as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework to make fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and the need to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

5. **Page 9 - Infrastructure**

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.
Tending District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016)

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

It is in my opinion that Infrastructure is one of the reasons that the District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document and previous local plans have selected Weeley because we are considered to be a Key Rural Service – Adopted Local Plan (2007) or an Expanded Settlement as on Page 65/67 Policy SPL 1 Managing Growth of the District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document 2016, as we are close to road networks and have a railway station, these perceived ideas are actually flawed for the following reasons:

Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weeley would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and St Andrews Road. These roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weeley on a daily procession.

Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at a standstill and trying to exit onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weeley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weeley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Evenings it’s the same along the A120 with cars often have to queue from the slip road and all the way back into Clacton and Weeley.

The Local Plan for Weeley is not sustainable and is in breach of many of the Local Plan Policies and the National Planning Policy Framework, the developments would be contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tending District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focused Changes and Policies CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

Name MR GARY LAMPS
Address .............................................................................................................

Signature


I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

For the following reasons as explained in conjunction with the relevant paragraphs:

The Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government
March 2016

Page 7 – Eligibility criteria

12. To be considered for government support under this section of the prospectus, proposals for a new garden village must meet the following criteria:

SIZE

13. For the purposes of this prospectus, we are defining garden villages, to include proposals that are not eligible under our existing offer, which is restricted to new towns and cities of over 10,000 homes. Therefore, to be eligible under this section of the prospectus, proposals must be for a new settlement of 1,500 – 10,000 homes.

Free-standing settlement

14. The garden village must be a new discrete settlement, and not an extension of an existing town or village. This does not exclude proposals where there are already a few existing homes.

Local leadership and community support

17. New garden villages should have the backing of the local authorities in which they are situated. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate a strong local commitment to delivery. They should also set how the local community is being, or will be, engaged at an early stage, and strategies for community involvement to help ensure local support.

Page 8

Local demand

21. It is important that new garden villages are built as a response to meeting housing needs locally. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate how the new settlement is part of a wider strategy to secure the delivery of new homes to meet assessed needs.

Page 9

Infrastructure

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.

The developments proposed for Weeley whilst all together they may amount to new homes in the region of 1,500 to 2,000, they cannot be considered as a new Garden Village as set by the The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government – March 2016. For the following reasons:
1. The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities clearly states that for a new village to be considered it must adhere to **Point 13 Size**, which states that in order to be considered as a Garden Village the minimum number of homes required to fulfil this requirement is 1,500 and not 800 to 1,100 as discussed by the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) and previous versions of the Local Plan in land allocated south of the railway line running along beside the Weeley Bridge Caravan Leisure Park and up to the Bowling Green Roundabout.

2. The area designated for the development of this new village cannot in my opinion be considered to be far enough away from the current village of Weeley to be fulfilling the requirement of **Point 14 Free-standing settlement**, due to its close proximity to houses on the opposite side of the B1441 Clacton Road and Weeley By-Pass. I do not classify a space that is equal to approximately 100 metres as qualifying as being considered sufficient to enable for this development to be called a Free-standing Settlement contrary to what is the government’s requirements.

3. In my opinion the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) does not lend itself to assisting the community in being able to be involved, as the document provides no actual information as to the amount of development proposed for the designated sites and fails to engage the reader, or assist them in being able to express an honest response to the document. It has been written purely for the benefit of the Local Council and Planning Committee without any real consideration for the general public.

4. **Page 8 - Local demand**

Whilst there may be a requirement for new homes as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and also in Policy SP1 in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016), which promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development that performs an economic, social and environmental role.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley are clearly not required by the residents of Weeley and that contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village which dates back to the Doomsday Book.

The level of development that is being proposed for a village with less than 500 houses would result in an increase in the size of the village in the region of 300%, I do not know how this kind of increase can be deemed as acceptable. For what is a rural settlement the scale of development proposed is in my opinion considerably too large to represent a sustainable, fair and proportionate increase in housing stock and would conflict with, and undermine, the core planning principle as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework to make fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and the need to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

5. **Page 9 - Infrastructure**

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.
It is in my opinion that infrastructure is one of the reasons that the District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document and previous local plans have selected Weeley because we are considered to be a Key Rural Service – Adopted Local Plan (2007) or an Expanded Settlement as on Page 65/67 Policy SPL 1 Managing Growth of the District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document 2016, as we are close to road networks and have a railway station, these perceived ideas are actually flawed for the following reasons:

Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weeley would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and St Andrews Road. These roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weeley on a daily procession.

Never there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weeley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weeley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Evenings it’s the same along the A120 with cars often have to queue from the slip road and all the way back into Clacton and Weeley.

The Local Plan for Weeley is not sustainable and is in breach of many of the Local Plan Policies and the National Planning Policy Framework, the developments would be contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focused Changes and Policies CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

For the following reasons as explained in conjunction with the relevant paragraphs:

**The Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government**
March 2016

Page 7 – Eligibility criteria

12. To be considered for government support under this section of the prospectus, proposals for a new garden village must meet the following criteria:

**SIZE**

13. For the purposes of this prospectus, we are defining garden villages, to include proposals that are not eligible under our existing offer, which is restricted to new towns and cities of over 10,000 homes. Therefore, to be eligible under this section of the prospectus, proposals must be for a new settlement of 1,500 – 10,000 homes.

**Free-standing settlement**

14. The garden village must be a new discrete settlement, and not an extension of an existing town or village. This does not exclude proposals where there are already a few existing homes.

**Local leadership and community support**

17. New garden villages should have the backing of the local authorities in which they are situated. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate a strong local commitment to delivery. They should also set how the local community is being, or will be, engaged at an early stage, and strategies for community involvement to help ensure local support.

Page 8

**Local demand**

21. It is important that new garden villages are built as a response to meeting housing needs locally. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate how the new settlement is part of a wider strategy to secure the delivery of new homes to meet assessed needs.

Page 9

**Infrastructure**

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.

The developments proposed for Weeley whilst all together they may amount to new homes in the region of 1,500 to 2,000, they cannot be considered as a new Garden Village as set by the The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government – March 2016. For the following reasons:
1. The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities clearly states that for a new village to be considered it must adhere to **Point 13 Size**, which states that in order to be considered as a Garden Village the minimum number of homes required to fulfill this requirement is 1,500 and not 800 to 1,100 as discussed by the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) and previous versions of the Local Plan in land allocated south of the railway line running along beside the Weeley Bridge Caravan Leisure Park and up to the Bowling Green Roundabout.

2. The area designated for the development of this new village cannot in my opinion be considered to be far enough away from the current village of Weeley to be fulfilling the requirement of **Point 14 Free-standing settlement**, due to its close proximity to houses on the opposite side of the B1441 Clacton Road and Weeley By-Pass. I do not classify a space that is equal to approximately 100 metres as qualifying as being considered sufficient to enable for this development to be called a Free-standing Settlement contrary to what is the government's requirements.

3. In my opinion the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) does not lend itself to assisting the community in being able to be involved, as the document provides no actual information as to the amount of development proposed for the designated sites and fails to engage the reader, or assist them in being able to express an honest response to the document. It has been written purely for the benefit of the Local Council and Planning Committee without any real consideration for the general public.

4. **Page 8 - Local demand**

Whilst there may be a requirement for new homes as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and also in Policy SP1 in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016), which promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development that performs an economic, social and environmental role.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley are clearly not required by the residents of Weeley and that contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village which dates back to the Doomsday Book.

The level of development that is being proposed for a village with less than 500 houses would result in an increase in the size of the village in the region of 300%, I do not know how this kind of increase can be deemed as acceptable. For what is a rural settlement the scale of development proposed is in my opinion considerably too large to represent a sustainable, fair and proportionate increase in housing stock and would conflict with, and undermine, the core planning principle as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework to make fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and the need to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

5. **Page 9 - Infrastructure**

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.
It is in my opinion that infrastructure is one of the reasons that the District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document and previous local plans have selected Weeley because we are considered to be a Key Rural Service – Adopted Local Plan (2007) or an Expanded Settlement as on Page 65/67 Policy SPL 1 Managing Growth of the District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document 2016, as we are close to road networks and have a railway station, these perceived ideas are actually flawed for the following reasons:

Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weeley would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and St Andrews Road. These roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weeley on a daily procession.

Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weeley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weeley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Evenings it’s the same along the A120 with cars often have to queue from the slip road and all the way back into Clacton and Weeley.

The Local Plan for Weeley is not sustainable and is in breach of many of the Local Plan Policies and the National Planning Policy Framework, the developments would be contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focused Changes and Policies CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).
I object to the proposals for Weele as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weele

The Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) – Section 4.3.6 Air Quality and Noise

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weele once you build 2000+ houses. We already have to deal with an ever increasing level of traffic through the village, which every morning and evening come peak times comes to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

The National Policy Statement for National Networks (December 2014) states the following:

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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.

Policy QL2 in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007 the adopted Local Plan) states that:

“All new development proposals should be located and designed to avoid reliance on the use of the private car and promote travel choice other than in exceptional circumstances. Permission will not be granted for development if it is not accessible by a choice of means of transport. Where necessary, measures to improve accessibility of development will be required (from the developer), particularly access by walking, cycling and public transport”.

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.

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.

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.

Strategic Part 1 - Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) page 21

3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring. Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within a reasonable walking distance, the frequency of the bus and rail service is limited and they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable and so therefore contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focussed Changes and Policy CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
25th August 2016
The Planning Policy Manager
Tendring District Council,
Council Offices,
Thorpe Road
Weeley
Essex CO16 9AJ

Dear Sir,

Re: The Future growth of Tendring

OBJECTIONS

1. The nature of Weeley and Weeley Heath, with at present, just 750 houses, will be radically changed to their detriment. The current proposal to build up to 1411 new houses in Weeley is totally ridiculous. This would quadruple the size of Weeley. There already are proposals for an additional 380 plus homes in both areas which would increase Weeley by 50%. Urban areas develop organically, businesses move to an area and workers move in, not the other way round. To claim otherwise is at best specious and at worst a canard. The proposal to build 11,000 homes in Tendring will, according to official figures create only 3-5,000 jobs, I would suspect that some of these will be in the construction of those same buildings, whilst the majority will be low paid service sector jobs. The 11,000 figure is far too large for a predominantly tourist and farming area, which is a peninsula. Proposed improvements to the Norwich-London mainline will inevitably create problems for commuters and tourists alike for a long period.

2. I would now like to address options for growth. Weeley is a close-knit community, with most people living in the area because they enjoy being in a rural environment. The proposed enlargement would sentence residents to over a decade of gridlocked roads and living within a building site. Such a development would most certainly not be contributing to supporting a strong, vibrant and healthy community as set out in Section 7 Bullet Point 2 (Social Role) of the NPPF.

3. The government admit that coastal towns in this area have structural problems, lacking industry and had a policy to deal with them. There was an unemployment rate of 8% last year. When I tried to find up-to-date statistics there was a footnote saying that the unemployment sample was too small for a reliable estimate of unemployment although lower figures were judged statistically significant in other areas. I will presume that Tendring’s unemployment rate is still about twice the regional average of 4.2%. Wage levels are lower than both the national and regional average by approximately £36 and £58 respectively. Youth employment is a major cause for concern. 17.5% of the population are on work related benefits compared to 9.8% regionally. 20% of children live in poverty whilst 1 in 5 citizens live seriously deprived areas. About a third are pensioners.

4. NPPF, Section 7, Bullet point 3 states that planning proposals should contribute to protecting and enhancing (Weeley’s) natural, built and historic environment. Bullet point 2 (Social Role) of the NPPF talks about expansion supporting a strong, vibrant community. The parish has 13 listed buildings. It is not simply the buildings themselves that are of historical significance but also their setting, (Par.28 NPPF).

TDC Policy SP 6 states that ‘future growth will be planned to ensure settlements maintain their distinctive character and roles and to avoid coalescence between them’. Looking at TDC’s local map of Weeley it is surrounded by development. I thus infer that whilst impinging on other villages is unacceptable surrounding one with development is acceptable. These plans would destroy the character and identity of Weeley, thus contravening National Planning Policies.

5. The claim that all the new houses will be for local residents is dubious. It would appear that 75% of the new housing will be private, for sale or rent, whilst the rest would be council or housing association
administered. We suspect that some of the new properties plus the vacated rented properties will be re-let to people practising benefit tourism as there are so few employment vacancies in the area.

6. By building on agricultural land you are taking away a productive asset which can never be replaced. TDC’s original plan was for 4,000 houses across the district. The 11,000 figure was imposed by a cabal of Central Government, ECC Braintree and Colchester Council. ECC’s desire for economies of scale and the desperate need for TDC to have an approved plan are key factors in forcing through this plan. David Cameron’s policy of ‘localism’ seems to have been a nonstarter. The new government preaches ‘one nation Conservatism’ Alas, Weeley seems not be part of this fairer society!

7. The roads are overcrowded already in the summer and during rush hours. Should the new occupants commute by road, the system is inadequate for driving to Colchester or further afield like Chelmsford or London. They will contribute to the dreadful congestion we already have. The road between the northern end of the by-pass and the Elmstead Market roundabout is a pinch point.

8. One reason for choosing Weeley was its railway station. The train service is infrequent; the platform too short, the buildings are derelict (shortly to be demolished) and you cannot even buy a ticket. It is unusable if you are disabled too, as one of the platforms is inaccessible. I have tried it. I am sure that improving this station would be more expensive than building a new station elsewhere.

9. The local primary school is full, so where will the extra children be accommodated? We can envisage that initially they will be faced with long-term temporary huts as I am sure this will be the transition stage until lots of the houses are built. As pupils age, will they be bussed to secondary schools? Which?

10. One advantage of the development according to the plan will be new shops and a Doctor’s Surgery. Thus, residents are faced with the choice between a few more local shops or the destruction of their community. GP recruitment is at crisis point in the area whilst Colchester Hospital faces many challenges.

11. Other parts of the infrastructure, like sewerage will be overstretched by the additional numbers. Owing to the high water table there are already serious foul water and surface water drainage problems. I suspect that the developer contributions in the form of Community Infrastructure Levies would be insufficient to cover the full costs.

12. Many of the above points are related to services. Given the drastic cuts facing council grants from the central government where will money be found for the new infrastructure needed? I would theorise that there will be a long time lag between building the houses and improving the infrastructure.

13. I recently attended an exhibition devoted to Tendring’s proposals and was surprised to learn that Weeley was chosen for expansion because of its strategic location at the centre of Tendring with good transport connections and relatively unconstrained land. I would dispute good transport links as indicated above – many areas of TDC have the latter. I believe that in choosing where the expansion would be concentrated the council chose certain ‘criteria’ Weeley came last and thus gets up to 1411 houses as its prize.

14. Emerging policies SD5 and SD9 are contravened which relate to the protection and enhancement of open space. Contrary to the design and access document there is a paucity of open space in Weeley. TDC’s Map 33 includes one area in Weeley Heath (not Weeley), a thin strip of grass with a tarmac path on it, a steep embankment and land in front of the crematorium.

15. This plan sees development ongoing for over a decade. The people of Weeley will endure inconvenience and disruption for this long period of time.

16. This plan was drawn with pre Brexit projections. I feel long term projects will suffer in uncertain times and builders, for example, will be charry of large projects which are largely speculative.
17. Weeley was defined by TDC’s consultants Drummond-Hay as a Rural Service Centre, where limited development should take place. Tendring planning officers took it upon themselves to re-designate Weeley as a Strategic Rural Service Centre with further areas within it that had been rejected by the consultants now being considered as acceptable for development.

Governments have a tendency to believe that they have the right to tell others what to do. They forget, conveniently, they are our elected representatives and the laws they pass are meant to make life more civilised, easier and equitable and not to be draconic. We live in an age where interest groups are influential and it would appear that other areas in Tendring have far more influence on policy than places like Weeley i.e. they have far ‘sharper elbows’. Laconically, the T.D.C. plan is at best nebulous and at worst impracticable – its ramifications ignored to the detriment of Weeley.

May I thank councillors for their altruism in throwing Weeley to the wolves? Finally, can I compliment the TDC on their PR and especially their ‘spin’?

Yours faithfully

[Redacted]

G.M. Bonnell
Received On

26 AUG 2016

Tendring District Council
Planning Dept
Town Hall
Station Road
Clacton on Sea
CO15 1SE

22nd August 2016

Objection to the Proposed new houses in Weeley, Essex

I am writing to you with great concerns over the Village of Weeley.

I am objecting to proposed new housing in our Village. As that what it is a Village not a Town, and it certainly is not big enough for the proposed new houses.

I live in Crow Lane, the speed the traffic comes down there is dangerous to say the least. My husband was injured and his car written off, just by him driving out of our drive. How can another 300+ cars down this Lane even be considered? My daughter and other children have to walk to the end of Crow Lane to catch there school bus; on many occasions my daughter has had to jump out of the way of speeding cars.

The road is not fit for lots more traffic.

We do not have the infrastructure within Weeley to support all these new houses.

Yours sincerely

Jane Mills
Dear Sirs

I wish to object to the local plan both in general terms and with specific regard to the plans for Weeley.

In general:
- No proven need for the volume of new housing for this district. The assumption must be that the proposed level of housing development is not for local needs.
- Planning blight for large sections of the local populations. Some of this development may or may not go ahead. Nationally, developers hold planning permissions for excess of 2.8 million houses.
- There is no guarantee that infrastructure levies would benefit the local community.
- The proposed plan goes against an original proposal of 10% addition to every village and town so that impact is minimised.
- Lack of resources within the Council to ensure that prerequisite conditions are met.

Weeley village
- Nearly 300% increase in population with no perceived gain for the local community. In effect swamping a small local village without the advantages of better services.
- Unsustainable – no jobs, poor transport, small schools. Stretched NHS services.
- Sections of Crow Lane have no main drainage or limited capacity. Would developers need to install sewage treatment plants?
- Crow Lane is a ‘rat run’ at peak times, has poor visibility, and is poorly maintained. There are no footpaths. Encroaching hedges and verges have over the years meant that buses and lorries cannot pass each other safely except at a crawl.
- Rainfall regularly causes flooding at three points along the road. Increased hard surfacing will increase the run off.
- Loss of green space, loss of good quality agricultural land
- Loss of camping amenity
- Springs and surface water near the by-pass railway bridge have caused significant undermining of the bridge, more run off could revive this problem.

Yours faithfully

Mrs Monica Kelleher
Objection to the Proposed Local Plan

- Building in Weeley Heath and Weeley Village has already reached its 10% quota for the next few years. The proposed developments are totally disproportionate and detrimental, and not in keeping with the rural nature of the region.
- The plan is OVER-DEVELOPMENT on a massive and totally unacceptable level, by anyone's standards. Increasing the size of a village from 750 dwellings to over 2500 cannot be right or proper.
- The land proposed is good agricultural land. Development is therefore CONTRARY to sustainability in my view!
- Health and well-being of the existing population under threat. There is no NHS provision to cover the extra population - build surgeries, but where will the staff come from? Likewise with schools and teaching staff.
- Motor Transport links are ghastly, the roads ill-maintained, and the slightest hiccup causes major tailbacks right from the A120 down to Weeley roundabout. Extra thousands of cars are not going to help that situation at all. Hold-ups to traffic exiting Clacton at weekends is up to a mile long to Weeley roundabout.
- Rail Transport is a joke. One local station, un-manned, with no ticket machine - services stopping at every local station to Colchester, and only running once an hour, not on Sundays. Far better would be the access to Manningtree main-line station from a development at Horsley Cross. Interestingly, the Chair of the Council’s Local Plan Committee admitted that he goes to Manningtree rather than catch a train locally!!
- Infrastructure in Tendring as a whole is at breaking point, as illustrated by the recent sink-hole appearing in Thorpe-le-Soken high street. Sewage backs up all along the pipes from Thorpe to Weeley, and overflows near the crematorium roundabout, and down under Weeley bridge. How on earth does anyone in their right mind expect it to cope with another 2000 dwellings?
- The council have completely ignored the historic and rural nature of Weeley, which is mentioned in the Domesday book and is one of the oldest villages in the area. Our historic sites need protection from encroachment by unnecessary and unwanted developments. The Church is well-known as being one of few standing in fields, and is much admired as such.
- It is the Tendring District Council’s stated aim to increase and encourage tourism. If they mean by that - building right up to the boundaries of the two caravan/chalet holiday camps in the area - then I fail to see what they hope to achieve. Holiday makers come here BECAUSE of the rural nature of the area, and they most certainly would not choose their holiday right next to a housing estate.
Dear Sirs,

We were very disappointed to see that 1500 houses are to be built in Breeley.

The reason we have a holiday home here is because of its rural nature. We live in a city and it is a joy to come to Breeley and experience country living. We will not enjoy the noise, dirt
general inconvenience of these houses being erected and shall probably not come down in the future, which is terribly sad.

Hee do urge you to think again. This is a rural area and it is so easy to ruin but a lot more difficult to bring back the lovely countryside.

Yours faithfully
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

For the following reasons as explained in conjunction with the relevant paragraphs:

The Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government
March 2016

Page 7 – Eligibility criteria

12. To be considered for government support under this section of the prospectus, proposals for a new garden village must meet the following criteria:

SIZE

13. For the purposes of this prospectus, we are defining garden villages, to include proposals that are not eligible under our existing offer, which is restricted to new towns and cities of over 10,000 homes. Therefore, to be eligible under this section of the prospectus, proposals must be for a new settlement of 1,500 – 10,000 homes.

Free-standing settlement

14. The garden village must be a new discrete settlement, and not an extension of an existing town or village. This does not exclude proposals where there are already a few existing homes.

Local leadership and community support

17. New garden villages should have the backing of the local authorities in which they are situated. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate a strong local commitment to delivery. They should also set how the local community is being, or will be, engaged at an early stage, and strategies for community involvement to help ensure local support.

Page 8

Local demand

21. It is important that new garden villages are built as a response to meeting housing needs locally. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate how the new settlement is part of a wider strategy to secure the delivery of new homes to meet assessed needs.

Page 9

Infrastructure

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.

The developments proposed for Weeley whilst all together they may amount to new homes in the region of 1,500 to 2,000, they cannot be considered as a new Garden Village as set by the The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government – March 2016. For the following reasons:
1. The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities clearly states that for a new village to be considered it must adhere to **Point 13 Size**, which states that in order to be considered as a Garden Village the minimum number of homes required to fulfil this requirement is 3,500 and not 800 to 1,100 as discussed by the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) and previous versions of the Local Plan in land allocated south of the railway line running along beside the Weeley Bridge Caravan Leisure Park and up to the Bowling Green Roundabout.

2. The area designated for the development of this new village cannot in my opinion be considered to be far enough away from the current village of Weeley to be fulfilling the requirement of **Point 14 Free-standing settlement**, due to its close proximity to houses on the opposite side of the B1441 Clacton Road and Weeley By-Pass. I do not classify a space that is equal to approximately 100 metres as qualifying as being considered sufficient to enable for this development to be called a Free-standing Settlement contrary to what is the government’s requirements.

3. In my opinion the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) does not lend itself to assisting the community in being able to be involved, as the document provides no actual information as to the amount of development proposed for the designated sites and fails to engage the reader, or assist them in being able to express an honest response to the document. It has been written purely for the benefit of the Local Council and Planning Committee without any real consideration for the general public.

4. Page 8 - Local demand

Whilst there may be a requirement for new homes as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and also in Policy SP1 in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016), which promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development that performs an economic, social and environmental role.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley are clearly not required by the residents of Weeley and that contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village which dates back to the Doomsday Book.

The level of development that is being proposed for a village with less than 500 houses would result in an increase in the size of the village in the region of 300%, I do not know how this kind of increase can be deemed as acceptable. For what is a rural settlement the scale of development proposed is in my opinion considerably too large to represent a sustainable, fair and proportionate increase in housing stock and would conflict with, and undermine, the core planning principle as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework to make fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and the need to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

5. Page 9 - Infrastructure

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.
Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016)

26th August 2016

It is in my opinion that infrastructure is one of the reasons that the District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document and previous local plans have selected Weeley because we are considered to be a Key Rural Service – Adopted Local Plan (2007) or an Expanded Settlement as on Page 65/67 Policy SPL 1 Managing Growth of the District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document 2016, as we are close to road networks and have a railway station, these perceived ideas are actually flawed for the following reasons:

Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weeley would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and St Andrews Road. These roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weeley on a daily procession.

Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weeley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weeley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Fratling having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Evenings it’s the same along the A120 with cars often have to queue from the slip road and all the way back into Clacton and Weeley.

The Local Plan for Weeley is not sustainable and is in breach of many of the Local Plan Policies and the National Planning Policy Framework, the developments would be contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SDB in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focused Changes and Policies CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]

[Redacted]
A120 towards Warminster and A120 towards Leicestershire.
The Planning Policy Manager  
Tendring District Council  
Council Offices  
Thorpe Road  
Weeley, CO16 9AJ  
Re Proposed New Housing in Weeley.

By Planning Services

Without the proper infrastructure included in these proposed new developments, the main beneficiaries (financially) will be the developers who will then move on to the next project.

Unless there are medical/educational/sufficient transport facilities included - there are still non-drivers living in this area - the outcome of the haphazard building areas - a few houses here - a larger number over there, etc. - will prove chaotic for the already busy roads.

Personally, living in Weeley and not having our own transport, a trip to the Surgery at Great Bentley requires the use of a taxi. Frequent trips, when necessary, make these expensive trips. We must, however, express our appreciation for our bus passes, as a journey into Clacton is necessary for weekly shopping.

Surely housing in the Government's responsibility and, in this respect, in view of the current shortage, new towns should be built with the appropriate infrastructure to go with them. The need is urgent as it was after World War II, and we would even suggest the re-introduction of prefabricated housing. New towns would also create employment and thus solve another current problem.

Perhaps these ideas have already been discussed, and discarded, but we felt we wanted to make our views known,

E. Simpson  
H. Simpson (Mrs.)

Weeley Heath, Essex CO16
Objection to the Proposed Local Plan

We hereby object to the following:

1. The overall number of proposed dwellings are far too excessive for a village the size of Weele... this would result in severe overdevelopment of what is an historic village of currently under 1000 dwellings total to date and with a potential of 2000 + upwards EXTRA if this plan is accepted.

2. Weele has already MORE than its fair quota of newbuild homes planned, or under construction already therefore the proposed number would ruin the village and be detrimental to our health and well being as is already the case for many residents.

3. The present local sewerage system is already a serious issue with leakage and flooding in peoples gardens and other areas already, further pressure on this system is not viable.

4. The local road and transport facilities and levels are already horrendous and a few thousand extra vehicles using these if so many homes were built would ensure even further delays and road blockages than we suffer already especially during peak & holiday times. Many local lanes are already seeing extra vehicles trying to avoid the main road backlogs.

5. Local transport is a nightmare already and holiday traffic is already finding it difficult to use these local roads. The holiday trade is most important to the area and should not have to suffer to the detriment of the area as it certainly soon will!

6. There is already a suitable location available at Horsley Cross that should satisfy the all of the aims of the Proposed Local Plan.

Signed: ................................................
Address: .............................................WELEY........................................post code: CO16
Date: 22. 8. 16
Dear Sirs,

I write to *object* to the proposed Local Plan for Weeley Village. Please find my written objections enclosed. You will find that my objections are many based on going through the entire Local Plan as published. I have raised what I consider to be the most pertinent points. While this may appear as a negative response I do object purely based on what I consider as harmful, detrimental and objectionable planning grounds regarding the various policies/references as published within the "Proposed Plan".

I also offer my *conclusion* for what I believe to be an alternative location for the whole proposed plan.

Local residents here do of course understand the need for a reasonable ‘local plan for Weeley’ BUT... we also believe that the horrendous enormity of the ‘proposed plan’ greatly exceeds all reasonable proportions regarding any expansion of the village. **THIS would be grossly harmful OVERDEVELOPMENT of the area, if adopted!**

**After all, TDC can ALWAYS say NO to future potential developers, given that the scales of numbers generally planned that would result in OVERDEVELOPMENT of the village of WEELEY!**

Therefore I propose that TDC adopts a more SENSIBLE & a more ACCEPTABLE, ‘Weeley Friendly’ forward plan... with “realistic numbers” of new build homes proposed, but also in more suitable places suiting WEELEY VILLAGE....NOT to simply follow outrageous numbers provided by the government. I would like to speak at relevant future planning meetings, also with any planning inspector IF & when the time comes.

Yours sincerely,

Colin Crane...
Policy Planning Manager...
Tendring District Council, Council Offices,
Thorpe Road, Weeley
Clacton-on-Sea Essex CO16 9AJ

16th August 2016.

Key Objections to the TDC “proposed” Local Plan:

The TDC ‘local plan proposal’ STATES that ‘SEA’ (Strategic Environmental Assessment) WAS originally a ‘European Directive’?... AS the UK is not to remain in the EU, and importantly before any adoption of the new plan or within its lifetime, then ‘SEA’ is then surely redundant & irrelevant?...TDC must take into account other seriously flawed & fictitious statistics as directed & provided by the EU in the past before considering a new plan.

When formulating a NEW LOCAL plan, any such assessment will certainly be unsustainable, detrimental & seriously flawed. They would also be irrelevant, IF such redundant EU directives remain in situ?

The above reasons are detrimental to any ‘assessment of local environment, social & economic characteristics and priorities’ & studies of the area.

- Likewise with HRA (Habitats Regulation Assessment)-also an EU directive) this will also be redundant & irrelevant most likely before any adoption of a NEW Local plan?
- There are several other similar anomalies contained within the Spatial Portrait (2:1) also other “policies” that are detrimental to the WEELEY aspect of the proposed plan where other suggested “facts” are in fact quite INCORRECT. E.g. Especially regarding the roads/transport network and railways (economy) within the WEELEY area as that area is QUITE different to others nearby.
- Weeley Village had apparently been selected for development stating that such transport networks are good?... The small railway station is but a ‘HOLT’ with one train per hour, stopping at all stations. It is at best a local shuttle service between villages, NOT a mainline station & with NO SUNDAY service and NO ticket purchasing facilities, it has been suggested that this station is likely to CLOSE anyway due to very poor patronage? It has minimul & unsecured car parking spaces for maybe 3 to 4 cars...?

A development of the proposed enormity constitutes gross OVERDEVELOPMENT !

** Weeley - an historic village of around 750-800 current dwellings – then increasing it by 2-3000 potential dwellings constitutes an HORRENDOUS OVERDEVELOPMENT, therefore cannot be a permissible development...!!!
The section of the proposed local plan stating that **WEELEY EXPANDED SETTLEMENT** has “Good Transport connections”? ... IS totally false! e.g. BOTH main through roads are gridlocked at all peak and at some OFF peak times *(A133/A120)* ... worse still during holiday times. Therefore *potential* commercial enterprise would be discouraged to start up here & would NOT even be viable due to the extremely POOR transport & roads network...the local rail facility, as already described above, is at best poor.

- **2:3 (part 2..) SP2 (Settlement development Boundaries):** This STATES that there is a **“general presumption” in favour of new development..”? ...Residents here do NOT accept any such “presumptions”... especially since all previous /most/ “others” have proven to be totally flawed & are incorrect!

- **Policy (part 2) SP3; Sustainable Design...** This STATES that **“all new developments should make a POSITIVE contribution to the quality of the local environment and protect or enhance local character”**...this whole reference to the policy is totally detrimental to, and is in direct conflict to all Weeley interests, also to the whole well being of the entire VILLAGE & its residents due to the enormity of the proposal.

- **Policy HP1: (Improving Health & Wellbeing)** This ‘proposal’ is NOT viable and has already proven to severely contradict itself! Local residents are already suffering ill health, stress and torment due to the very thought of this proposed overdevelopment!...NONE of the content under this section is therefore viable.

- Weeley does not have a doctor’s surgery OR pharmacy, the nearest village surgery is already FULL and unable to accept new patients, with long current waiting lists for appointments. NHS funding & resources system is already unable to adequately staff, or fund current local facilities NOW, let alone support new ones where they suggest that they will NOT be funding such.

**Policy HP2; Community Facilities. (item c) Providing Green Spaces...** it appears that such “green spaces “ already exist, yet could soon to be BUILT OVER...!!!
- **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 also in direct contravention of this policies content.

- **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 impede, any of this aspect and would NOT become viable due to the vast coverage of proposed buildings and hard surfaces, as proposed - also regarding many other proposed local sites that are fast removing the same “benefits”.

- **Policy 5:4 Housing layout (Garden Cities principle)....** NOT practical and cannot possibly comply to the criteria as stipulated within the proposed document; - due to lack of required ‘acreage’/space per site.

- **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 a **GROSS OVERDEVELOPMENT!**

- **Policy PP8: Tourism.**...already this is both flawed & troublesome, due to the **ONLY two major ingress/egress routes to the whole area are already at full capacity, especially 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, therefore ANY number of new dwellings within WEELEY village, or surrounding areas would prove fatal. ALL local villages need either routes to get access to ANYWHERE?...smaller feeder roads such as B1441 &B1033 & B1027 are already being used to circumvent these holdups and these (often) small “lanes “ are not designed OR able to accommodate the HUGE volumes of traffic already having to use them & where many DANGEROUS situations have already occurred recently.

- **Policy CP3 “Improving the Transport Network”;** This cannot be achieved given the excessive number & size of potential EXTRA vehicles that such an **overdeveloped area** would create in the short, also longer term
Recent “assessments & surveys” have been poorly advised and poorly carried out, yet ensuing “statistics” have been utilised it seems, despite being both irrelevant and fatally “inaccurate” and even worse still, “INCOMPLETE” where severe congestion at some holiday periods WAS NOT RECORDED for the purpose !!!
Therefore IT will be most UNSAFE to formulate any new ‘Local Plan’ based on such horrendously erroneous information...? Plainly ANY traffic numbers WILL plainly increase to an unmanageable level - IF the proposed number of dwellings ever became accepted...!

- **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!!

- **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 so if we take into account future changes OR Climate change (as we ARE required to do) with heavier future rains expected...It is also well proven that large areas of concrete/tarmac surfaces WILL and DO increase flooding along with other risks becoming far higher than at current. Therefore it is surely UNSAFE and UNWISE to increase the problems, plainly already there and unmanaged still. Under such circumstances ‘SuDS’ would be fruitless & inadequate of course!

- **POLICY PPL5: Water conservation, Drainage and Sewerage;** Local Sewerage problems are already proving unmanageable & unhealthy.

*Weeley has already suffered several incidents of overflowing sewage leaking ABOVE GROUND into fields and gardens, therefore ANY further pressure to this infrastructure would certainly prove CATASTROPHIC!!!
(5)

- **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’ would adversely compromise and be detrimental to the very nature of agriculture for NOW - ALSO - FOR THE FUTURE...e.g. The Proposed Plan would be extremely counterproductive - thus proving highly detrimental, also in direct conflict 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 the same "agricultural land” would become a building site & and would remain so FOREVER... (future food crops?)

- **Policy PPL3: The Rural Landscape:** much of the existing “Rural Landscape “would change beyond all recognition... IF this proposal ever 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:**

I therefore suggest that Weeley is left as a small to medium sized ‘VILLAGE’ with just its currently planned local “expansions” as intended, being the will of the majority of its residents.

*Alternatively:* The whole “Proposed Local Plan Development” could easily be relocated to HORSLEY CROSS, where the entire proposed scheme can easily be accommodated there.

Horsley Cross is situated directly beside the A120 that could then receive its much needed upgrade to become a dual carriageway in the same process. This would also greatly improve the access routes to and from the ports. It is already an approved, suitable industrial/commercial site & in need of such development. The area is also within striking distance of a main line railway route with excellent services to both London & Norwich mainline stations. I therefore suggest that Horsley Cross could then become "Horsley Cross Village Garden" in its own entity, thereby ticking all boxes.

Mr Colin Crane....5 Bentley Road...

Weeley Heath ..Clacton on Sea.....Essex    CO16 5DT.

Tel : 01255 830 778........(mrccrane@gmail.com)
To whom it may concern

(Have submitted this on the website, hours ahead of the deadline, but it has not yet been processed, and I want to ensure it is registered.)

Please select the options to indicate whether you support, object to, or would like to vary.

Object

Reasons

There is already a chronic (and worsening) congestion problem at peak times for road users travelling from Weeley to Colchester. Rail options are sparse, expensive and unsuitable for many. Journeys to work already involve significant amounts of wasted time sitting in traffic queues in order to leave the Weeley area.

The thought of placing such a huge additional burden on an already difficult situation is ludicrous, and could not have been made with any reference to the interests of Weeley residents, as a glance at the proliferation of objections currently displayed by individuals and organisations every few steps around the village illustrates.

The lack of firm proposals regarding the A133, Frating roundabout and Weeley roundabout, reflects a lack of insight into current problems. The determined refusal not to consider alternatives (such as the area of the A120 connecting Colchester and Harwich) for proposed development is bizarre.

Vague statements about the possibility of securing future 'contributions' are clearly empty rhetoric designed to disguise the catastrophic impact of the proposed development on an already difficult transport situation. An additional road to take some of the Clacton traffic would only serve to alleviate the current situation; it would be insufficient to accommodate the huge new burden of traffic between Weeley and Frating that would inevitably result from this proposal.

These plans are unsustainable, very disproportionate, and unfair.

Stakeholder breakdown

- Members of the Public
Dear Sir or Madam,

Please find attached my representation.

Regards
David Hillman
SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL AND STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT-COMMON STRATEGIC PART 1 LOCAL PLANS

REPRESENTATION FORM

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Please use this form for sending comments to the Council on the Common North Essex Strategic Part 1 Local Plans- Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) 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 Monday 19th 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 or 01255 686188 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. The Council will enter responses on a computer database, to be used by the Council for the purpose of recording and collating comments and 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.

PART A – DETAILS OF PERSON OR ORGANISATION MAKING THE REPRESENTATION

PLEASE PRINT ALL DETAILS

Name of person or organisation making the representation:
David Hillman..........................................................................................................................

If an organisation, please provide a contact name: ..................................................................

E-mail: davidhillman@btinternet.com.................................................... Tel No: 07909536841..............

Address (put the organisation address if relevant): 9 The Street, Weeley, ...............
................................................................................................................................................ Post Code: CO16 9JF
PART B – DETAILS OF REPRESENTATION

If you are making comments in response to any of the specific sections in the SA/SEA Document, please make sure to indicate which section(s) you are commenting on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section No. or Paragraph No.</th>
<th>Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I accept that over the coming years there will be some requirement for additional housing and that Weeley should bear an increase proportionate to its present size. Presently there are several housing developments within the village which have approval or are already in progress. These developments alone must account for a sizeable part of Weeley's fair share of future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the planned massive over development of Weeley whereby it is expected to bear one sixth of the whole Tendring requirement. This is unfair to a small community and I feel that Weeley is being sacrificed to meet the district's total requirement. I am concerned about the likely increase in traffic. The village Post Office, which is a great asset to the Village, already attracts a great deal of traffic and consequently The Street has become problematic with cars frequently parking on the pavement on both sides of the road. This is damaging the pavements and presents a hazard to both drivers and pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am also concerned that the road major routes into the area may not support the expected increase in traffic. The A133 is a single carriageway and already suffers serious congestion in the Weeley area. Also the A120 between Great Bromley and Little Bentley and the A133 from the A120 junction to Little Clacton have an appalling accident record in recent years. These matters will need to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

FAIR PROCESSING NOTICE – DATA PROTECTION ACT 1998

Please note that any comments submitted cannot be treated as private and confidential and may be made available for public inspection. Respondents' details will be held on a database in accordance with the terms of Tendring District Council's registration with the UK Information Commissioner pursuant to the Data Protection Act 1998.

Please sign and date this form: Signed: David Hillman Date: 01/09/2016

Thank you for your comments

The council will consider all comments received during the consultation period. The information gained will be used to make an informed decision for the next stage of the SA/SEA process.
I am writing to register our objections to the Proposed Local Plan.

I have attended Council Planning meetings and am sure you are more than aware of objections and the thoughts and opinions of the residents of Weeley. Including:
- Lack of schools
- Limited road transport options
- Limited train service
- Lack of jobs
- Lack of GP's.
- One local shop.

The Project is far too big for our village and will turn it into a concrete jungle. I am sure that major towns like Colchester, Chelmsford, and Harlow could possibly accommodate this amount of housing but Weeley cannot.

Please think about this Plan very carefully, people move here because it is a village, because their properties are not overshadowed by hundreds of houses, this building work will obviously affect many lives and have a significant forever impact on our beautiful countryside.

Weeley will be a village no longer, it will be a town, a rather large built up area. This is not what we moved here for.

Denise & Gary Bunyan
Weeley
CO16

Mary Foster

From: Denise Bunyan
Sent: 04 September 2016 12:07
To: Planning,policy
Subject: Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document
Dear Sir

I am writing to object to the local plan for C30 Weeley.

The reasons for this are:

1. The A120 access road is already congested most of the day. 7-8.30 am and 4-6 pm are gridlocked. The recent warm weather has also brought down many holiday makers who will think twice about coming to the area if they cannot move on our roads.

2. The railway is one of the reasons Weeley has been chosen. This is expensive, does not have disabled access, does not have a reasonable or safe car park, the platform is too short for the London trains so there are not regular trains to London. Most people drive to Thorpe to get to London as they are direct from there. Buses are hourly for certain hours each day.

3. There is no doctor or dentist's surgery. Great Bentley surgery is already overwhelmed and the waiting time for a GP appointment is ridiculous. Clacton has a hospital but no A&E - if there is emergency treatment needed getting to Colchester because of the gridlocked roads is a nightmare.

4. The roads are already dangerous to cycle on and the pavements are poorly maintained and overgrown. We gave up a long time ago trying to cycle anywhere.

5. The waste pumping station by Willow Walk is regularly overwhelmed when it rains with raw sewerage coming up through plugholes. All Weeley waste is currently pumped to Thorpe for processing.

6. There is no police presence in Weeley or Weeley Heath.

7. There are no jobs in the area. Clacton is a deprived area with high unemployment, Colchester towards London is where the jobs are - and this is difficult to access because of the transport problems mentioned in point 2.

8. We are a small village of less than 1000 residents - it is not fair or right to increase the population and build over green belt in the way that is planned.

I hope that you take into account the local opposition to the development in Weeley.
It is not the right place to develop into a small town.

Helen and Frank Lally

[Redacted]
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map.34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified? In comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my opinion it is irresponsible to propose such large 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and the provision of key services like Education, Healthcare and the other necessary Infrastructure that is required like sewage. Then there is the impact on the Rural Economy, loss of Habitat and so many more issues which it would cause, with no guarantee that these key areas would be addressed appropriately. It seems irresponsible for Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies to consider large scale developments without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: LUCY PARTRIDGE
Address: "Redacted"
Tendring District Council Preferred Local Plan

I would like to submit my observations and objections concerning the possible building of 1500+ houses in the village of Weeley as outlined in the Preferred Local Plan.

According to the draft plan you are proposing building over 1000 houses in Frinton, Walton, Kirby, Thorpe and Little Clacton, together with at least 2000 houses in the Clacton/W. Holland area and another 1500+ houses at Weeley. This is 4500+ homes who will presumably own at least one car, many of which need to access the A133 at the Weeley roundabout. Weeley is a pinch point where 3 roads converge and this is where there are plans to build 1500+ houses.

The B1033, B1441 and A133 (which has been identified as the 2nd most dangerous road in Essex after the A12) would be unable to accommodate safely, the large amounts of additional traffic generated by such extensive development. Such large-scale expansion would most certainly not be contributing to supporting a strong, vibrant and healthy community as set out in section 7 ii of the NPPF - it would be destroying it. It would completely destroy the character and identity of Weeley, thus contravening the National Planning policies.

We are told there will be updates to the A12, A120 and to some extent the A133, yet we know full well there is little or nothing that can be done to widen the existing network of minor roads and lanes within the Tendring District area.

As a local resident I can see that the plans are unworkable. Bus and rail services are limited and the road network cannot be adapted to accommodate the huge increase in traffic that would be generated. Commuters driving to Colchester, Ipswich and Clacton are already experiencing serious delays in their journeys. During the summer months the Weeley section of the B1033 is already experiencing constant streams of traffic as holidaymakers travel to Frinton and Walton. This also affects Thorpe as this traffic passes through their narrow High Street.

We are also given to understand that Tendring has not been included in the list of priority improvements for rail services, which will exacerbate the inevitable roads crisis that is bound to arise from these housing targets. Weeley Station is unmanned and served only by slow, infrequent local trains and will not be the preferred choice of most commuters, most of whom will use their cars to work outside the Tendring area.

Worryingly we are also told the building of 10000 homes will only result in the hope that 6000 additional jobs can be created in the Tendring Peninsula.
There is currently no doctor's surgery in Weeley and NHS policies indicate that a new surgery will not be forthcoming. The village is served by practices in Great Bentley and Thorpe, both of which need to be accessed by car. Both are very busy and non-urgent appointments are weeks ahead. Most of the local practices in Clacton have closed their books to new patients and the district as a whole is unable to attract the extra G.P.'s it desperately needs. Colchester General Hospital continues to struggle under the inevitable pressure of having to cover too wide an area. How will it cope with all the extra patients arising from all the proposed new housing in Tendring and Colchester? Is there room for expansion of hospital services at Colchester? Again, because of the siting of the hospital, it is really only accessible from the Tendring area by car.

The primary school in Weeley is already full and we have learnt that were this level of development to take place, proposals for a new primary school in the village are unlikely to materialize, and to where will secondary age pupils be bussed as there is a limit to the number that can be accommodated at Tendring Technology College? There are new family houses that are being built in Weeley at the moment - where will any children associated with these houses go to school?

Who are we building all these houses for?
How many will be for local people?
How many of these houses will be lived in by people who are on the TDC's housing list?
Is there a need for the large numbers of house that are being quoted?
Will London boroughs be able to buy houses to put their tenants in?

A recently published Housing Needs report commissioned by TDC admits that one of the factors taken into account when arriving at the target figures is the anticipated London overspill. It would be unfair if Weeley were to be swamped by large numbers of people from outside the area.
The proposed mass over-development which has been proposed for Weeley, as well as the applications that have already been approved, will not fulfill any social, economic or environmental needs and will result in the loss of a thriving and vibrant community, whilst completely destroying a historic village that dates back to the Domesday Book.

These proposals, which will benefit only the developers and landowners, would destroy our village and take away productive and much needed farmland, which can never be replaced.
Planners are most definitely not treating Weeley in a fair and proportionate way especially by indicating there is also the potential to expand even further along the A133 to deliver 2000+ homes and associated facilities beyond 2032. Recently the planning committee have turned down planning applications in local villages because it would lead to urbanisation. Surely the same must be said for the proposed developments in Weeley? So why should we be treated differently?
Weeley is a village of approximately 500 houses and currently in this area there has already been applications for 47 new properties, an increase of 9.5%. The proposal to build 1500-2000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300-400%.

Is this fair and proportionate?

We are a close-knit community in Weeley, with most people choosing to live in the area because we enjoy our rural environment. Such large scale proposals for our small village would sentence residents to living constantly alongside grid-locked roads and building sites for many years to come.

Please listen to what the people of Weeley are saying to you. We have a village school, 2 village shops, a thriving community and open spaces that we call countryside around us, and this is the way the villagers of Weeley like it and hope beyond all hope to keep it.

Pamela Dear
Weeley
CO16
Weekly is a member of approximately 800 houses and communities in this area. The project seeks three primary purposes for A1 new buildings: an increase of 800-2000 houses to build in villages of this size would support sustainability initiatives of 800-2000.

We are a diverse and community of Weekly with many people living to the


Presso for our small villages with services located at small community


Weekly love it and hope everyone feels as good as
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton. Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified. In comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

Policy TR11a 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.

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.
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 my opinion it is irresponsible to propose such large 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and the provision of key services like Education, Healthcare and the other necessary infrastructure that is required like sewage. Then there is the impact on the Rural Economy, loss of Habitat and so many more issues which it would cause, with no guarantee that these areas would be addressed appropriately. It seems irresponsible for Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies to consider large scale developments without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: ROBIN DEAR

Address: WEELY \ TACION ON SAA ESSEY

C.O.IK.
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/ Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified? Then in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-developement in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
I object to the proposals for Weeley Planning Options Consultation Document – C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) – Section 4.3.6 Air Quality and Noise

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weeley once you build the 2000+ houses. We already have to deal with an ever increasing level of traffic through the village which every morning and evening come peak times comes to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

National Policy Statement for National Networks December 2014

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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within reasonable walking distance, the frequency of the bus and rail service is limited and they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: [REDACTED]  Signature: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED] Weeley, Essex, CO16 9AJ
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) – Section 4.3.6 Air Quality and Noise

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weeley once you build the 2000+ houses. We already have to deal with an ever increasing level of traffic through the village which every morning and evening come peak times comes to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

National Policy Statement for National Networks December 2014

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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.**

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within reasonable walking distance, the frequency of the bus and rail service is limited and they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: Louise Golds

Address: 

Signature: Weeley, Essex
Planning Policy Team (Proposed Local Plan),
Tendring District Council,
Thorpe Road,
Weeley.

2nd Sept 2016.

OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED LOCAL PLAN.

We understand that as far as Weeley is concerned the effect of the proposed Local Development Plan will be as follows.

1/. To build 1400 homes so enlarging Weeley village by 200% which is neither fair or reasonable as it will completely alter its character and effectively turn it into a small town.

2/. Increase Weeley population by approx 2,800 adults. Really not a very bright thing to do in a place where there is little or no employment available and inadequate medical facilities.

3/. Increase the number of children by 3,300 (assuming average 2.4 children per family) when the local primary schools are at bursting point and there is no proposal to build new schools.

4/. Increase traffic by approx 2,800 cars when traffic is already gridlocked between Weeley and Frating roundabouts every morning and evening when there is no real alternative as the buses will be stuck in the traffic and the only train is a 'slow' one every hour.

Frankly it's bonkers! And we OBECT to it.

Lesley Groom

John Groom

3 Mill Lane
Weeley Heath,
Essex
CO169BG
Planning Policy Team (Proposed Local Plan),
Tendring District Council,
Thorpe Road,
Weeley.

2nd Sept 2016.

OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED LOCAL PLAN.

We understand that as far as Weeley is concerned the effect of the proposed Local Development Plan will be as follows.

1/. To build 1400 homes so enlarging Weeley village by 200% which is neither fair or reasonable as it will completely alter is character and effectively turn it into a small town.

2/. Increase Weeley population by approx 2,800 adults. Really not a very bright thing to do in a place where there is little or no employment available and inadequate medical facilities.

3/. Increase the number of children by 3,300 (assuming average 2.4 children per family) when the local primary schools are at bursting point and there is no proposal to build new schools.

4/. Increase traffic by approx 2,800 cars when traffic is already gridlocked between Weeley and Frating roundabouts every morning and evening when there is no real alternative as the buses will be stuck in the traffic and the only train is a 'slow' one every hour.

Frankly it's bonkers! And we OBECT to it.

Lesley Groom

Weeley Heath,
Essex
CO16
Planning Policy Team (Proposed Local Plan),
Tendring District Council,
Thorpe Road,
Weeley.

2nd Sept 2016.

OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED LOCAL PLAN.

We understand that as far as Weeley is concerned the effect of the proposed Local Development Plan will be as follows.

1/. To build 1400 homes so enlarging Weeley village by 200% which is neither fair or reasonable as it will completely alter is character and effectively turn it into a small town.

2/. Increase Weeley population by approx 2,800 adults. Really not a very bright thing to do in a place where there is little or no employment available and inadequate medical facilities.

3/. Increase the number of children by 3,300 (assuming average 2.4 children per family) when the local primary schools are at bursting point and there is no proposal to build new schools.

4/. Increase traffic by approx 2,800 cars when traffic is already gridlocked between Weeley and Frating roundabouts every morning and evening when there is no real alternative as the buses will be stuck in the traffic and the only train is a 'slow' one every hour.

Frankly it's bonkers! And we OBJECT to it.

Lesley Groom
3 Mill Lane
Weeley Heath,
Essex
CO169BG

John Groom
3 Mill Lane,
Weeley Heath
Essex
CO169BG.
Planning Policy Team (Proposed Local Plan),
Tendring District Council,
Thorpe Road,
Weeley.

2nd Sept 2016.

OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED LOCAL PLAN.

We understand that as far as Weeley is concerned the effect of the proposed Local Development Plan will be as follows.

1/. To build 1400 homes so enlarging Weeley village by 200% which is neither fair or reasonable as it will completely alter is character and effectively turn it into a small town.

2/. Increase Weeley population by approx 2,800 adults. Really not a very bright thing to do in a place where there is little or no employment available and inadequate medical facilities.

3/. Increase the number of children by 3,300 (assuming average 2.4 children per family) when the local primary schools are at bursting point and there is no proposal to build new schools.

4/. Increase traffic by approx 2,800 cars when traffic is already gridlocked between Weeley and Frinton roundabouts every morning and evening when there is no real alternative as the buses will be stuck in the traffic and the only train is a 'slow' one every hour.

Frankly it's bonkers! And we OBJECT to it.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process): all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

Paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.

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 my 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 and this is without the additional traffic which will be created by developments proposed for other areas that will also need to join these already overwhelmed roads.

**Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity** in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016)

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weeley would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and possibly St Andrews Road and Second Avenue. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-Le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weeley on a daily procession.

Then the B1441 has a similar problem with traffic coming from Clacton-on-Sea, Great Clacton and Little Clacton. Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at almost a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weeley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weeley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Then come the evening it is the same again and if you are trying to return home along the A120 you will often have to start queuing as you make your way up the slip road.

How can it be considered sensible to build in an area where at present the roads cannot cope with the capacity of cars and so to build another 1,500 to 2,000 houses, which would result in an increase of traffic in the region of 3,000 to 4,000 cars is definitely unsustainable. Further-more the National Policy Statement for National Networks – December 2014 states the following:
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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.
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4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring.

Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within reasonable walking distance. The frequency of the bus and rail service is limited with mostly one train per hour, no service on a Sunday and no direct route to London or Norwich. So in my opinion they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable. The developments would fail against the social role set out in Paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and its Core Principle of making the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and would be contrary to Policy CP1 and CP2. The proposal should therefore not constitute sustainable development.
Infrastructure includes services, like education; the criteria required is flawed as one of the reasons Weeley was identified as a Key Rural Area for development is because of the misapprehension that Weeley has a Primary School, which in fact is not the case as indicated in the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) - Page 218 C30 Map 33 Weeley. Weeley village also does not have any facilities in the way of medical healthcare with there being neither doctors' or dentists' surgeries and so any developments would have to not just say that there would be a possibility of these services being provided but would need to deliver in order to comply with the Policy SP4.

The current situation for healthcare is already being stretched beyond its limits with a long wait for Doctors appointments, due to the fact that the two surgeries that provide care for Weeley residents are both at full capacity. So would not able to accommodate the number of people that would result from all the proposed developments not just here in Weeley, but also in Great Bentley, Thorpe, Kirby to name a few. Colchester Hospital is also being expected to deal with an ever increasing level of demands on its staff and services, whilst at the same time having to find ways to reduce the amount of expenditure due to the Trust's current financial situation.

I would have thought that before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more, like sewage, flooding, the loss of natural habitat, the loss of fertile agricultural land and the potential increased threat to residents and car drivers. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
29th August 2016

Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016)

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

I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

Paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.

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 my 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 and this is without the additional traffic which will be created by developments proposed for other areas that will also need to join these already overwhelmed roads.

Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016)

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weeley would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and possibly St Andrews Road and Second Avenue. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weeley on a daily procession.

Then the B1441 has a similar problem with traffic coming from Clacton-on-Sea, Great Clacton and Little Clacton. Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at almost a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weeley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weeley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Then come the evening it is the same again and if you are trying to return home along the A120 you will often have to start queuing as you make your way up the slip road.

How can it be considered sensible to build in an area where at present the roads cannot cope with the capacity of cars and so to build another 1,500 to 2,000 houses, which would result in an increase of traffic in the region of 3,000 to 4,000 cars is definitely unsustainable. Further more the National Policy Statement for National Networks – December 2014 states the following:
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.

- leading to a marked deterioration in the experience of road users. For some, particularly those with time-pressuered journeys, congestion can cause frustration and stress, as well as inconvenience, reducing the quality of life.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.
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4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring.

Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within reasonable walking distance. The frequency of the bus and rail service is limited with mostly one train per hour, no service on a Sunday and no direct route to London or Norwich. So in my opinion they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable. The developments would fail against the social role set out in Paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and its Core Principle of making the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and would be contrary to Policy CP1 and CP2. The proposal should therefore not constitute sustainable development.
Infrastructure includes services, like education; the criteria required is flawed as one of the reasons Weeley was identified as a Key Rural Area for development is because of the misapprehension that Weeley has a Primary School, which in fact is not the case as indicated in the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) - Page 218 C30 Map 33 Weeley. Weeley village also does not have any facilities in the way of medical healthcare with there being neither doctors' or dentists' surgeries and so any developments would have to not just say that there would be a possibility of these services being provided but would need to deliver in order to comply with the Policy SP4.

The current situation for healthcare is already being stretched beyond its limits with a long wait for Doctors appointments, due to the fact that the two surgeries that provide care for Weeley residents are both at full capacity. So would not able to accommodate the number of people that would result from all the proposed developments not just here in Weeley, but also in Great Bentley, Thorpe, Kirby to name a few. Colchester Hospital is also being expected to deal with an ever increasing level of demands on its staff and services, whilst at the same time having to find ways to reduce the amount of expenditure due to the Trust’s current financial situation.

I would have thought that before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more, like sewage, flooding, the loss of natural habitat, the loss of fertile agricultural land and the potential increased threat to residents and car drivers. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

**Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the Districts increase in housing stock over the plan period.** This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

Paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

**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.

**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.

**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 my 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 and this is without the additional traffic which will be created by developments proposed for other areas that will also need to join these already overwhelmed roads.

**Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity** in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016)

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weeley would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and possibly St Andrews Road and Second Avenue. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weeley on a daily procession.

Then the B1441 has a similar problem with traffic coming from Clacton-on-Sea, Great Clacton and Little Clacton. Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at almost a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weeley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weeley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Then come the evening it is the same again and if you are trying to return home along the A120 you will often have to start queuing as you make your way up the slip road.

How can it be considered sensible to build in an area where at present the roads cannot cope with the capacity of cars and so to build another 1,500 to 2,000 houses, which would result in an increase of traffic in the region of 3,000 to 4,000 cars is definitely unsustainable. Further-more the National Policy Statement for National Networks – December 2014 states the following:
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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.
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4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring.

Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within reasonable walking distance. The frequency of the bus and rail service is limited with mostly one train per hour, no service on a Sunday and no direct route to London or Norwich. So in my opinion they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable. The developments would fail against the social role set out in Paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and its Core Principle of making the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and would be contrary to Policy CP1 and CP2. The proposal should therefore not constitute sustainable development.
Infrastructure includes services, like education; the criteria required is flawed as one of the reasons Weeley was identified as a Key Rural Area for development is because of the misapprehension that Weeley has a Primary School, which in fact is not the case as indicated in the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016). Weeley village also does not have any facilities in the way of medical healthcare with there being neither doctors’ or dentists’ surgeries and so any developments would have to not just say that there would be a possibility of these services being provided but would need to deliver in order to comply with the Policy SP4.

The current situation for healthcare is already being stretched beyond its limits with a long wait for Doctors appointments, due to the fact that the two surgeries that provide care for Weeley residents are both at full capacity. So would not able to accommodate the number of people that would result from all the proposed developments not just here in Weeley, but also in Great Bentley, Thorpe, Kirby to name a few. Colchester Hospital is also being expected to deal with an ever increasing level of demands on its staff and services, whilst at the same time having to find ways to reduce the amount of expenditure due to the Trust’s current financial situation.

I would have thought that before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more, like sewage, flooding, the loss of natural habitat, the loss of fertile agricultural land and the potential increased threat to residents and car drivers. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: [Signature]
Address: 18 Rectory Rd, Weeley Heath, Clacton on Sea, CO16 9AX
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District's increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

Paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.

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 Weele 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 my 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 and this is without the additional traffic which will be created by developments proposed for other areas that will also need to join these already overwhelmed roads.

Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016)

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weele would be routed onto the B1441 Weele By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and possibly St Andrews Road and Second Avenue. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weele on a daily procession.

Then the B1441 has a similar problem with traffic coming from Clacton-on-Sea, Great Clacton and Little Clacton. Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at almost a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weele is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weele via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Then come the evening it is the same again and if you are trying to return home along the A120 you will often have to start queuing as you make your way up the slip road.

How can it be considered sensible to build in an area where at present the roads cannot cope with the capacity of cars and so to build another 1,500 to 2,000 houses, which would result in an increase of traffic in the region of 3,000 to 4,000 cars is definitely unsustainable. Further-more the National Policy Statement for National Networks – December 2014 states the following:
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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.
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4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring.

Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within reasonable walking distance. The frequency of the bus and rail service is limited with mostly one train per hour, no service on a Sunday and no direct route to London or Norwich. So in my opinion they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable. The developments would fail against the social role set out in Paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and its Core Principle of making the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and would be contrary to Policy CP1 and CP2. The proposal should therefore not constitute sustainable development.
Infrastructure includes services, like education; the criteria required is flawed as one of the reasons Weeley was identified as a Key Rural Area for development is because of the misapprehension that Weeley has a Primary School, which in fact is not the case as indicated in the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) - Page 218 C30 Map 33 Weeley. Weeley village also does not have any facilities in the way of medical healthcare with there being neither doctors’ or dentists’ surgeries and so any developments would have to not just say that there would be a possibility of these services being provided but would need to deliver in order to comply with the Policy SP4.

The current situation for healthcare is already being stretched beyond its limits with a long wait for Doctors appointments, due to the fact that the two surgeries that provide care for Weeley residents are both at full capacity. So would not able to accommodate the number of people that would result from all the proposed developments not just here in Weeley, but also in Great Bentley, Thorpe, Kirby to name a few. Colchester Hospital is also being expected to deal with an ever increasing level of demands on its staff and services, whilst at the same time having to find ways to reduce the amount of expenditure due to the Trust’s current financial situation.

I would have thought that before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more, like sewage, flooding, the loss of natural habitat, the loss of fertile agricultural land and the potential increased threat to residents and car drivers. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

[Signature]

Name: [Handwritten Name]

Address: [Handwritten Address]

Weeley Heath
Clacton on Sea CO16
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tending District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tending District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 - 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy: Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally: paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by ear, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: C. Mattox
Address: 14 Hilltop Crescent, Weeley CO16 9HZ
Signature: [Signature]
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy: Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley and so how can this statement be justified then in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally: paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 experiences frequent traffic jams. In my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
I object to the proposals for Weele as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weele.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weele is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weele does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weele.

On page 27 you indicate that Weele has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weele; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weele but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weele Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weele</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weele Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name ................................................. Signature .........................................

Address .................................

.................................
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

**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.

**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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in – Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified? When in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: MEG V. C. BLOWER
Signature: V. C. BLOWER
Address: 33 2ND AVE, WEELEY, CLACTON-ON-SEA, CO16 9HX.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified? Then in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley. The Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) – Section 4.3.6 Air Quality and Noise.

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weeley once you build 2000+ houses. We already have to deal with an ever increasing level of traffic through the village, which every morning and evening comes peak times, on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current resident, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

The National Policy Statement for National Networks (December 2014) states the following:

**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.

- 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.

- Constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

**Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.**

**Policy QL2 in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007 the adopted Local Plan) states that:**

“All new development proposals should be located and designed to avoid reliance on the use of the private car and promote travel choice other than in exceptional circumstances. Permission will not be granted for development if it is not accessible by a choice of means of transport. Where necessary, measures to improve accessibility of development will be required (from the developer), particularly access by walking, cycling and public transport”.

**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.”**
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.

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.

strategic Part 1 - Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) page 21

4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring. Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within a reasonable walking distance, the frequency of the bus and rail service is limited and they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable and so therefore contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focussed Changes and Policy CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like flooding, sewage and the loss of agricultural land. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name...J.BLOUWE
Signature...J.BLOUWE

Address...38, SECOND AVE, WEELEY, CO16 9HX
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out in page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley
The Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) – Section 4.3.6 Air Quality and Noise

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weeley once you build 2000+ houses. We already have to deal with an ever increasing level of traffic through the village, which every morning and evening come peak times comes to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

The National Policy Statement for National Networks (December 2014) states the following:

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.

- 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.

- Constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.

Policy QL2 in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007 the adopted Local Plan) states that:

“All new development proposals should be located and designed to avoid reliance on the use of the private car and promote travel choice other than in exceptional circumstances. Permission will not be granted for development if it is not accessible by a choice of means of transport. Where necessary, measures to improve accessibility of development will be required (from the developer), particularly access by walking, cycling and public transport”.

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.
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.

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.
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4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring. Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within a reasonable walking distance, the frequency of the bus and rail service is limited and they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable and so therefore contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focussed Changes and Policy CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like flooding, sewage and the loss of agricultural land. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name ................................................................. Signature .................................................................

Address ..............................................................................................................................................
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name ........................................ Signature ........................................
Address .............................................. Weeley, CO16 ........................
..............................................
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) – Section 4.3.6 Air Quality and Noise

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weeley once you build 2000+ houses. We already have to deal with an ever increasing level of traffic through the village, which every morning and evening come peak times comes to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

The National Policy Statement for National Networks (December 2014) states the following:

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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.

Policy QL2 in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007 the adopted Local Plan) states that:

“All new development proposals should be located and designed to avoid reliance on the use of the private car and promote travel choice other than in exceptional circumstances. Permission will not be granted for development if it is not accessible by a choice of means of transport. Where necessary, measures to improve accessibility of development will be required (from the developer), particularly access by walking, cycling and public transport”.

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.
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.

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.
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4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring. Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weelely Railway Station is also within a reasonable walking distance, the frequency of the bus and rail service is limited and they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable and so therefore contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focussed Changes and Policy CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like flooding, sewage and the loss of agricultural land. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name .............................................. Signature ..............................................

Address .................................................................

11, ST ANDREW'S ROAD, WEELEY, CLACTON-ON-SEA, ESSEX, CO16 9H.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) – Section 4.3.6 Air Quality and Noise

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weeley once you build 2000+ houses. We already have to deal with an ever increasing level of traffic through the village, which every morning and evening come peak times comes to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

The National Policy Statement for National Networks (December 2014) states the following:

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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.

Policy QL2 in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007 the adopted Local Plan) states that:

“All new development proposals should be located and designed to avoid reliance on the use of the private car and promote travel choice other than in exceptional circumstances. Permission will not be granted for development if it is not accessible by a choice of means of transport. Where necessary, measures to improve accessibility of development will be required (from the developer), particularly access by walking, cycling and public transport”.

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.
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.

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.

4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring. Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within a reasonable walking distance, the frequency of the bus and rail service limited and they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable and so therefore contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focussed Changes and Policy CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like flooding, sewage and the loss of agricultural land. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name ............................................................... Signature ..............................................................
Address ............................................................... WEELY, CLACTON-ON-SEA, Essex CO16 1LE
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village or its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally, paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and the provision of key services like Education, Healthcare and the other necessary Infrastructure that is required like sewage. Then there is the impact on the Rural Economy, loss of Habitat and so many more issues which it would cause, with no guarantee that these key areas would be addressed appropriately. It seems irresponsible for Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies to consider large scale developments without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: Sam Pott
Address: 12, Grauwood Close, Weeley, CO16 9DG
Signature: [Signature]

I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally, paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 Weele 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 my 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.

Travelling from Weele to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and the provision of key services like Education, Healthcare and the other necessary Infrastructure that is required like sewage. Then there is the impact on the Rural Economy, loss of Habitat and so many more issues which it would cause, with no guarantee that these key areas would be addressed appropriately. It seems irresponsible for Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies to consider large scale developments without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: Sam Port
Address: Weele, CO16 9AJ
Signature: 
Date: 21st August 2016
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

For the following reasons as explained in conjunction with the relevant paragraphs:

The Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government
March 2016

Page 7 – Eligibility criteria

12. To be considered for government support under this section of the prospectus, proposals for a new garden village must meet the following criteria:

SIZE

13. For the purposes of this prospectus, we are defining garden villages, to include proposals that are not eligible under our existing offer, which is restricted to new towns and cities of over 10,000 homes. Therefore, to be eligible under this section of the prospectus, proposals must be for a new settlement of 1,500 – 10,000 homes.

Free-standing settlement

14. The garden village must be a new discrete settlement, and not an extension of an existing town or village. This does not exclude proposals where there are already a few existing homes.

Local leadership and community support

17. New garden villages should have the backing of the local authorities in which they are situated. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate a strong local commitment to delivery. They should also set how the local community is being, or will be, engaged at an early stage, and strategies for community involvement to help ensure local support.

Page 8

Local demand

21. It is important that new garden villages are built as a response to meeting housing needs locally. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate how the new settlement is part of a wider strategy to secure the delivery of new homes to meet assessed needs.

Page 9

Infrastructure

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.

The developments proposed for Weeley whilst all together they may amount to new homes in the region of 1,500 to 2,000, they cannot be considered as a new Garden Village as set by the The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government – March 2016. For the following reasons:
1. The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities clearly states that for a new village to be considered it must adhere to Point 13 Size, which states that in order to be considered as a Garden Village the minimum number of homes required to fulfil this requirement is 1,500 and not 800 to 1,100 as discussed by the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) and previous versions of the Local Plan in land allocated south of the railway line running along beside the Weeley Bridge Caravan Leisure Park and up to the Bowling Green Roundabout.

2. The area designated for the development of this new village cannot in my opinion be considered to be far enough away from the current village of Weeley to be fulfilling the requirement of Point 14 Free-standing settlement, due to its close proximity to houses on the opposite side of the B1441 Clacton Road and Weeley By-Pass. I do not classify a space that is equal to approximately 100 metres as qualifying as being considered sufficient to enable for this development to be called a Free-standing Settlement contrary to what is the government’s requirements.

3. In my opinion the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) does not lend itself to assisting the community in being able to be involved, as the document provides no actual information as to the amount of development proposed for the designated sites and fails to engage the reader, or assist them in being able to express an honest response to the document. It has been written purely for the benefit of the Local Council and Planning Committee without any real consideration for the general public.

4. Page 8 - Local demand

Whilst there may be a requirement for new homes as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and also in Policy SP1 in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016), which promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development that performs an economic, social and environmental role.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley are clearly not required by the residents of Weeley and that contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village which dates back to the Doomsday Book.

The level of development that is being proposed for a village with less than 500 houses would result in an increase in the size of the village in the region of 300%, I do not know how this kind of increase can be deemed as acceptable. For what is a rural settlement the scale of development proposed is in my opinion considerably too large to represent a sustainable, fair and proportionate increase in housing stock and would conflict with, and undermine, the core planning principle as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework to make fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and the need to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

5. Page 9 - Infrastructure

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.
26th August 2016

Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016)

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

It is in my opinion that infrastructure is one of the reasons that the District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document and previous local plans have selected Weeley because we are considered to be a Key Rural Service – Adopted Local Plan (2007) or an Expanded Settlement as on Page 65/67 Policy SPL 1 Managing Growth of the District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document 2016, as we are close to road networks and have a railway station, these perceived ideas are actually flawed for the following reasons:

Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weeley would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and St Andrews Road. These roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weeley on a daily procession.

Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weeley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weeley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Evenings it’s the same along the A120 with cars often have to queue from the slip road and all the way back into Clacton and Weeley.

The Local Plan for Weeley is not sustainable and is in breach of many of the Local Plan Policies and the National Planning Policy Framework, the developments would be contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focused Changes and Policies CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

Name: [Signature]
Address: 14 Crawenward Close Colbourn
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

For the following reasons as explained in conjunction with the relevant paragraphs:

**The Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government March 2016**

**Page 7 – Eligibility criteria**

12. To be considered for government support under this section of the prospectus, proposals for a new garden village must meet the following criteria:

**SIZE**

13. For the purposes of this prospectus, we are defining garden villages, to include proposals that are not eligible under our existing offer, which is restricted to new towns and cities of over 10,000 homes. Therefore, to be eligible under this section of the prospectus, proposals must be for a new settlement of 1,500 – 10,000 homes.

**Free-standing settlement**

14. The garden village must be a new discrete settlement, and not an extension of an existing town or village. This does not exclude proposals where there are already a few existing homes.

**Local leadership and community support**

17. New garden villages should have the backing of the local authorities in which they are situated. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate a strong local commitment to delivery. They should also set how the local community is being, or will be, engaged at an early stage, and strategies for community involvement to help ensure local support.

**Page 8**

**Local demand**

21. It is important that new garden villages are built as a response to meeting housing needs locally. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate how the new settlement is part of a wider strategy to secure the delivery of new homes to meet assessed needs.

**Page 9**

**Infrastructure**

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.

The developments proposed for Weeley whilst all together they may amount to new homes in the region of 1,500 to 2,000, they cannot be considered as a new Garden Village as set by the The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government – March 2016. For the following reasons:
1. The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities clearly states that for a new village to be considered it must adhere to **Point 13 Size**, which states that in order to be considered as a Garden Village the minimum number of homes required to fulfil this requirement is 1,500 and not 800 to 1,100 as discussed by the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) and previous versions of the Local Plan in land allocated south of the railway line running along beside the Weeley Bridge Caravan Leisure Park and up to the Bowling Green Roundabout.

2. The area designated for the development of this new village cannot in my opinion be considered to be far enough away from the current village of Weeley to be fulfilling the requirement of **Point 14 Free-standing settlement**, due to its close proximity to houses on the opposite side of the B1441 Clacton Road and Weeley By-Pass. I do not classify a space that is equal to approximately 100 metres as qualifying as being considered sufficient to enable for this development to be called a Free-standing Settlement contrary to what is the government's requirements.

3. In my opinion the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) does not lend itself to assisting the community in being able to be involved, as the document provides no actual information as to the amount of development proposed for the designated sites and fails to engage the reader, or assist them in being able to express an honest response to the document. It has been written purely for the benefit of the Local Council and Planning Committee without any real consideration for the general public.

4. **Page 8 - Local demand**

Whilst there may be a requirement for new homes as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and also in Policy SP1 in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016), which promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development that performs an economic, social and environmental role.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley are clearly not required by the residents of Weeley and that contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village which dates back to the Doomsday Book.

The level of development that is being proposed for a village with less than 500 houses would result in an increase in the size of the village in the region of 300%, I do not know how this kind of increase can be deemed as acceptable. For what is a rural settlement the scale of development proposed is in my opinion considerably too large to represent a sustainable, fair and proportionate increase in housing stock and would conflict with, and undermine, the core planning principle as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework to make fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and the need to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

5. **Page 9 - Infrastructure**

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.
It is in my opinion that infrastructure is one of the reasons that the District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document and previous local plans have selected Weeley because we are considered to be a Key Rural Service – Adopted Local Plan (2007) or an Expanded Settlement as on Page 65/67 Policy SPL 1 Managing Growth of the District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document 2016, as we are close to road networks and have a railway station, these perceived ideas are actually flawed for the following reasons:

Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weeley would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and St Andrews Road. These roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weeley on a daily procession.

Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weeley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weeley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Evenings it’s the same along the A120 with cars often have to queue from the slip road and all the way back into Clacton and Weeley.

The Local Plan for Weeley is not sustainable and is in breach of many of the Local Plan Policies and the National Planning Policy Framework, the developments would be contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focused Changes and Policies CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).
I object to the proposals for Weelely as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weelely.

The Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) – Section 4.3.6 Air Quality and Noise.

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weelely once you build 2000+ houses. We already have to deal with an ever increasing level of traffic through the village, which every morning and evening. Come peak times comes to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

The National Policy Statement for National Networks (December 2014) states the following:

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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.

Policy QL2 in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007 the adopted Local Plan) states that:

“All new development proposals should be located and designed to avoid reliance on the use of the private car and promote travel choice other than in exceptional circumstances. Permission will not be granted for development if it is not accessible by a choice of means of transport. Where necessary, measures to improve accessibility of development will be required (from the developer), particularly access by walking, cycling and public transport”.

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.
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.

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.

Strategic Part 1 - Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) page 21

4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring. Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very unlikely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within a reasonable walking distance, the frequency of the bus and rail service is limited and they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable and so therefore contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focused Changes and Policy CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like flooding, sewage and the loss of agricultural land. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: Paul Hudson
Address: 
Clacton-on-Sea, Essex
Weeley
Signature:
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified? When in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally: paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: JOSEPHINE SHIPP
Signature: [Redacted]
Address: .......................................................... WEELY, ESSEX, CO16 ..........................
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 216 of Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley
For the following reasons as explained in conjunction with the relevant paragraphs:

**The Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government March 2016**

**Page 7 – Eligibility criteria**

12. To be considered for government support under this section of the prospectus, proposals for a new garden village must meet the following criteria:

**SIZE**

13. For the purposes of this prospectus, we are defining garden villages, to include proposals that are not eligible under our existing offer, which is restricted to new towns and cities of over 10,000 homes. Therefore, to be eligible under this section of the prospectus, proposals must be for a new settlement of 1,500 – 10,000 homes.

**Free-standing settlement**

14. The garden village must be a new discrete settlement, and not an extension of an existing town or village. This does not exclude proposals where there are already a few existing homes.

**Local leadership and community support**

17. New garden villages should have the backing of the local authorities in which they are situated. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate a strong local commitment to delivery. They should also set how the local community is being, or will be, engaged at an early stage, and strategies for community involvement to help ensure local support.

**Page 8**

**Local demand**

21. It is important that new garden villages are built as a response to meeting housing needs locally. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate how the new settlement is part of a wider strategy to secure the delivery of new homes to meet assessed needs.

**Page 9**

**Infrastructure**

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.

The developments proposed for Weeley whilst all together they may amount to new homes in the region of 1,500 to 2,000, they cannot be considered as a new Garden Village as set by the The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government – March 2016. For the following reasons:
1. The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities clearly states that for a new village to be considered it must adhere to **Point 13 Size**, which states that in order to be considered as a Garden Village the minimum number of homes required to fulfil this requirement is 1,500 and not 800 to 1,100 as discussed by the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) and previous versions of the Local Plan in land allocated south of the railway line running along beside the Weeley Bridge Caravan Leisure Park and up to the Bowling Green Roundabout.

2. The area designated for the development of this new village cannot in my opinion be considered to be far enough away from the current village of Weeley to be fulfilling the requirement of **Point 14 Free-standing settlement**, due to its close proximity to houses on the opposite side of the B1441 Clacton Road and Weeley By-Pass. I do not classify a space that is equal to approximately 100 metres as qualifying as being considered sufficient to enable for this development to be called a Free-standing Settlement contrary to what is the government’s requirements.

3. In my opinion the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) does not lend itself to assisting the community in being able to be involved, as the document provides no actual information as to the amount of development proposed for the designated sites and fails to engage the reader, or assist them in being able to express an honest response to the document. It has been written purely for the benefit of the Local Council and Planning Committee without any real consideration for the general public.

4. **Page 8 - Local demand**

   Whilst there may be a requirement for new homes as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and also in Policy SP1 in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016), which promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development that performs an economic, social and environmental role.

   It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley are clearly not required by the residents of Weeley and that contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village which dates back to the Doomsday Book.

   The level of development that is being proposed for a village with less than 500 houses would result in an increase in the size of the village in the region of 300%, I do not know how this kind of increase can be deemed as acceptable. For what is a rural settlement the scale of development proposed in my opinion considerably too large to represent a sustainable, fair and proportionate increase in housing stock and would conflict with, and undermine, the core planning principle as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework to make fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and the need to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

5. **Page 9 - Infrastructure**

   29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.
It is in my opinion that infrastructure is one of the reasons that the District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document and previous local plans have selected Weeley because we are considered to be a Key Rural Service – Adopted Local Plan (2007) or an Expanded Settlement as on Page 65/67 Policy SPL 1 Managing Growth of the District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document 2016, as we are close to road networks and have a railway station, these perceived ideas are actually flawed for the following reasons:

**Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity**

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weeley would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and St Andrews Road. These roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weeley on a daily procession.

Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weeley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weeley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Evenings it’s the same along the A120 with cars often have to queue from the slip road and all the way back into Clacton and Weeley.

The Local Plan for Weeley is not sustainable and is in breach of many of the Local Plan Policies and the National Planning Policy Framework, the developments would be contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focused Changes and Policies CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).
I object to the proposals for Weele as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weele

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

**Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period.** This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weele, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weele a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

Paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

**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.

**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.

**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 my 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 and this is without the additional traffic which will be created by developments proposed for other areas that will also need to join these already overwhelmed roads.

Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016)

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors' and dentists' surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weeley would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and possibly St Andrews Road and Second Avenue. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weeley on a daily procession.

Then the B1441 has a similar problem with traffic coming from Clacton-on-Sea, Great Clacton and Little Clacton. Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at almost a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weeley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weeley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Then come the evening it is the same again and if you are trying to return home along the A120 you will often have to start queuing as you make your way up the slip road.

How can it be considered sensible to build in an area where at present the roads cannot cope with the capacity of cars and so to build another 1,500 to 2,000 houses, which would result in an increase of traffic in the region of 3,000 to 4,000 cars is definitely unsustainable. Further-more the National Policy Statement for National Networks – December 2014 states the following:
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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.**

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.

**Strategic Part 1 - Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) page 21**

4.3.8 - Transport - whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring.

Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within reasonable walking distance. The frequency of the bus and rail service is limited with mostly one train per hour, no service on a Sunday and no direct route to London or Norwich. So in my opinion they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable. The developments would fail against the social role set out in Paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and its Core Principle of making the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and would be contrary to **Policy CP1 and CP2. The proposal should therefore not constitute sustainable development.**
Infrastructure includes services, like education; the criteria required is flawed as one of the reasons Weeley was identified as a Key Rural Area for development is because of the misapprehension that Weeley has a Primary School, which in fact is not the case as indicated in the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) - Page 218 C30 Map 33 Weeley. Weeley village also does not have any facilities in the way of medical healthcare with there being neither doctors’ or dentists’ surgeries and so any developments would have to not just say that there would be a possibility of these services being provided but would need to deliver in order to comply with the Policy SP4.

The current situation for healthcare is already being stretched beyond its limits with a long wait for Doctors appointments, due to the fact that the two surgeries that provide care for Weeley residents are both at full capacity. So would not able to accommodate the number of people that would result from all the proposed developments not just here in Weeley, but also in Great Bentley, Thorpe, Kirby to name a few. Colchester Hospital is also being expected to deal with an ever increasing level of demands on its staff and services, whilst at the same time having to find ways to reduce the amount of expenditure due to the Trust’s current financial situation.

I would have thought that before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more, like sewage, flooding, the loss of natural habitat, the loss of fertile agricultural land and the potential increased threat to residents and car drivers. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: Alan Platson
Address: Weeley CO16

Signature
I object to the proposals for Weele as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weele

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weele is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weele does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weele.

On page 27 you indicate that Weele has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weele; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weele but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weele Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weele</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weele Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.81.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified. Then in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and the provision of key services like Education, Healthcare and the other necessary Infrastructure that is required like sewage. Then there is the impact on the Rural Economy, loss of Habitat and so many more issues which it would cause, with no guarantee that these key areas would be addressed appropriately. It seems irresponsible for Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies to consider large scale developments without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C. Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement cores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 my 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: GEOFFREY NEEDHAM
Address: WEELEY
Date: 21/08/2016
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

For the following reasons as explained in conjunction with the relevant paragraphs:

**The Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government March 2016**

**Page 7 – Eligibility criteria**

12. To be considered for government support under this section of the prospectus, proposals for a new garden village must meet the following criteria:

**SIZE**

13. For the purposes of this prospectus, we are defining garden villages, to include proposals that are not eligible under our existing offer, which is restricted to new towns and cities of over 10,000 homes. Therefore, to be eligible under this section of the prospectus, proposals must be for a new settlement of 1,500 – 10,000 homes.

**Free-standing settlement**

14. The garden village must be a new discrete settlement, and not an extension of an existing town or village. This does not exclude proposals where there are already a few existing homes.

**Local leadership and community support**

17. New garden villages should have the backing of the local authorities in which they are situated. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate a strong local commitment to delivery. They should also set how the local community is being, or will be, engaged at an early stage, and strategies for community involvement to help ensure local support.

**Page 8**

**Local demand**

21. It is important that new garden villages are built as a response to meeting housing needs locally. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate how the new settlement is part of a wider strategy to secure the delivery of new homes to meet assessed needs.

**Page 9**

**Infrastructure**

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.

The developments proposed for Weeley whilst all together they may amount to new homes in the region of 1,500 to 2,000, they cannot be considered as a new Garden Village as set by the The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government – March 2016. For the following reasons:
1. The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities clearly states that for a new village to be considered it must adhere to \textbf{Point 13} \textbf{Size}, which states that in order to be considered as a Garden Village the minimum number of homes required to fulfil this requirement is 1,500 and not 800 to 1,100 as discussed by the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) and previous versions of the Local Plan in land allocated south of the railway line running along beside the Weeley Bridge Caravan Leisure Park and up to the Bowling Green Roundabout.

2. The area designated for the development of this new village cannot in my opinion be considered to be far enough away from the current village of Weeley to be fulfilling the requirement of \textbf{Point 14} \textbf{Free-standing settlement}, due to its close proximity to houses on the opposite side of the B1441 Clacton Road and Weeley By-Pass. I do not classify a space that is equal to approximately 100 metres as qualifying as being considered sufficient to enable for this development to be called a Free-standing Settlement contrary to what is the government’s requirements.

3. In my opinion the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) does not lend itself to assisting the community in being able to be involved, as the document provides no actual information as to the amount of development proposed for the designated sites and fails to engage the reader, or assist them in being able to express an honest response to the document. It has been written purely for the benefit of the Local Council and Planning Committee without any real consideration for the general public.

4. \textbf{Page 8 - Local demand}

Whilst there may be a requirement for new homes as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and also in Policy SP1 in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016), which promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development that performs an economic, social and environmental role.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley are clearly not required by the residents of Weeley and that contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village which dates back to the Doomsday Book.

The level of development that is being proposed for a village with less than 500 houses would result in an increase in the size of the village in the region of 300%, I do not know how this kind of increase can be deemed as acceptable. For what is a rural settlement the scale of development proposed is in my opinion considerably too large to represent a sustainable, fair and proportionate increase in housing stock and would conflict with, and undermine, the core planning principle as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework to make fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and the need to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

5. \textbf{Page 9 - Infrastructure}

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.
It is in my opinion that infrastructure is one of the reasons that the District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document and previous local plans have selected Weoley because we are considered to be a Key Rural Service – Adopted Local Plan (2007) or an Expanded Settlement as on Page 65/67 Policy SPL 1 Managing Growth of the District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document 2016, as we are close to road networks and have a railway station, these perceived ideas are actually flawed for the following reasons:

Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weoley would be routed onto the B1441 Weoley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and St Andrews Road. These roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weoley on a daily procession.

Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weoley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weoley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Evenings it’s the same along the A120 with cars often have to queue from the slip road and all the way back into Clacton and Weoley.

The Local Plan for Weoley is not sustainable and is in breach of many of the Local Plan Policies and the National Planning Policy Framework, the developments would be contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focused Changes and Policies CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on page 238 in G Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%. Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs. it would in fact have the oppose effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
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.

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.

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 my 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.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already agued with in this District.

Name [NAME REDACTED]......................................Signature [SIGNATURE REDACTED]......................................
Address [ADDRESS REDACTED]......................................Weeley..........................Clacton-on-Sea..........................
Essex CO16........[POSTCODE REDACTED]......................................
Little Clacton

C016

2.09.2016

REPRESENTATION FOR LOCAL PLAN HILLSIDE COTTAGE WEELEY.

Dear Sir

I am writing to you to ask if you would please consider the inclusion of a very small area of land on the corner of Clacton Road and Church Lane, Weeley in the new local plan (see enclosed area highlighted in orange).

The current proposal would appear to have left this outside of housing development limits when this was the site of Hillside Cottage and part of the Hillside House/Cravenwood Estate.

Hillside Cottage was demolished some years back by Essex County Council to make way for a new road scheme which did not take place.

Sections of the old cottage foundations are still lying amongst the undergrowth. There is also a brick built structure with front and side door, bay window and working fireplace still on site. Pictures of the existing structure and Hillside Cottage can be viewed on a currant planning application number 16/0038/ out which is pending a decision.

Allowing this small area to be included in the new local plan would make perfect sense by putting back Hillside Cottage, which formed part of the Hillside House estate, and at the same time this would allow the trees to be managed and maintained in co-ordination with the local council tree officer. This would create a more attractive view from the kerbside and in doing so making this corner plot something for Weeley village to be proud of rather than a dense overgrown area that a present is running wild with no management.

Kind regards

Mr C Harriott
Planning Committee

Objection To The Local Plan.

I strongly object to the proposals for Wsecy.

We already have ever increasing levels of traffic. Morning and evening peak times result in a slow crawl on the B1441, B1033 and onto the A133. Any more local development on the space proposed will increase the risk to health and well-being of the local residents. Traffic congestion constrains the economy and impacts negatively on quality of life, this is especially true where traffic is routed through small communities.

Policy QL2 in the Local Plan (2007) states that all new development proposals should be located to avoid reliance on the use of private cars.

Wsecy is on a branch line for the railway, with no plans to increase train service, a minimal bus service and roads unsafe for cycling. There is not a viable alternative to the car for everyday travel as required for a residential development of this size and so is contrary to Policy QL2, T1a, SD8 and Policy CP1, CP2 of the Preferred Options Consultation Document.

The present sewage system is already an issue, surface water results in local waterlogging/flooding in parts of
The area. Further pressure on the system is not viable. Heavy rainfall would be likely to increase the risk of flooding. With such a large scale development the number of proposed dwellings would result in overdevelopment of a village which has already taken a fair quota of newbuild homes, planned or already under construction. The local infrastructure will not cope. There is already a more suitable location available at Horsley/Cross that would satisfy all the aims of the proposed local plan.

H.M. Tweed

Westley
Essex
CO16 0

26/8/16
By Planning Services

I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) – Section 4.3.6 Air Quality and Noise

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weeley once you build 2000+ houses. We already have to deal with an ever increasing level of traffic through the village, which every morning and evening come peak times comes to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

The National Policy Statement for National Networks (December 2014) states the following:

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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 **The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.**

Policy QL2 in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007 the adopted Local Plan) states that:

“All new development proposals should be located and designed to avoid reliance on the use of the private car and promote travel choice other than in exceptional circumstances. Permission will not be granted for development if it is not accessible by a choice of means of transport. Where necessary, measures to improve accessibility of development will be required (from the developer), particularly access by walking, cycling and public transport”.

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.

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.

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.

Strategic Part 1 - Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) page 21

13.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now give in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring. Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within a reasonable walking distance, the frequency of the bus and rail service is limited and they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable and so therefore contrary Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan PreSubmission Focussed Changes and Policy CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
Dear Sirs

By Planning Services

Objection to the Proposed Local Plan

- Building in Weeley Heath and Weeley Village has already reached its 10% quota for the next few years. The proposed developments are totally disproportionate and detrimental, and not in keeping with the rural nature of the region.
- The plan is OVER-DEVELOPMENT on a massive and totally unacceptable level, by anyone's standards. Increasing the size of a village from 750 dwellings to over 2500 cannot be right or proper.
- The land proposed is good agricultural land. Development is therefore CONTRARY to sustainability in my view!
- Health and well-being of the existing population under threat. There is no NHS provision to cover the extra population - build surgeries, but where will the staff come from? Likewise with schools and teaching staff.
- Motor Transport links are ghastly, the roads ill-maintained, and the slightest hiccup causes major tailbacks right from the A120 down to Weeley roundabout. Extra thousands of cars are not going to help that situation at all! Hold-ups to traffic exiting Clacton at weekends is up to a mile long to Weeley roundabout.
- Rail Transport is a joke. One local station, un-manned, with no ticket machine - services stopping at every local station to Colchester, and only running once an hour, not on Sundays. Far better would be the access to Manningtree main-line station from a development at Horsley Cross. Interestingly, the Chair of the Council's Local Plan Committee admitted that he goes to Manningtree rather than catch a train locally!!
- Infrastructure in Tendring as a whole is at breaking point, as illustrated by the recent sink-hole appearing in Thorpe-le-Soken high street. Sewage backs up all along the pipes from Thorpe to Weeley, and overflows near the crematorium roundabout, and down under Weeley bridge. How on earth does anyone in their right mind expect it to cope with another 2000 dwellings?
- The council have completely ignored the historic and rural nature of Weeley, which is mentioned in the Domesday book and is one of the oldest villages in the area. Our historic sites need protection from encroachment by unnecessary and unwanted developments. The Church is well-known as being one of few standing in fields, and is much admired as such.
- It is the Tendring District Council's stated aim to increase and encourage tourism. If they mean by that - building right up to the boundaries of the two caravan/chalet holiday camps in the area - then I fail to see what they hope to achieve. Holiday makers come here BECAUSE of the rural nature of the area, and they most certainly would not choose their holiday right next to a housing estate.

Name

Address

Signed

Date 19/11/16
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) – Section 4.3.6 Air Quality and Noise

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weeley, Thorpe, Kirby and other villages that are connected by this road once you build 2000+ houses. We already have to deal with an ever increasing level of traffic through these villages, which every morning and evening come peak times comes to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

The National Policy Statement for National Networks (December 2014) states the following:

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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within reasonable walking distance for some of the developments, the frequency of the bus and rail service is limited and they do not provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable.

In my opinion before anymore developments are carried out within this area, I would think that it is essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies, can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name ........................................... Signature ...........................................
Address .................................................. Date ..............................
Dear Sirs:

Re: Planning Greed

A. Why put new buildings at the end of the line? Where to go - into the sea?
B. Traffic is now appalling - nobody going way to anybody - it is taking your life into your own hands when leaving your own drive way.
C. Doctors, schools on a day to day delivering & collecting of children is hopeless to park allow at least an hour in the afternoon for parking & collecting of children - I know. I do it for my grand daughter.
D. Appointment with or requesting a visit from a doctor, hopeless & scary - 3 visits requested from doctor was requested for my elderly lady - when the doctor arrived 5 hours later my lady had died.

There is no room for people now for people to be calm considerate on the main roads or the "country lanes" - God help anybody riding a horse or pony.
850,000 empty properties in this country at the last count - why do we need more?

Because it makes a lot of money for a lot of people with total disregard for the quality of life of people.

Any building should be - if needed - should be in the centre of the centre. Great Britain - where people can spread out - for work & pleasure - not jammed up at the end of the country like rats in a trap.

Yours faithfully
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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. No attempt, whatever, is being made by the authority to reduce the excess speed of vehicles, or fly-past at 30 mph near Hadleigh Grammar School Rd.

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.
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 my opinion it is irresponsible to propose such large 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.

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and the provision of key services like Education, Healthcare and the other necessary Infrastructure that is required like sewage. Then there is the impact on the Rural Economy, loss of Habitat and so many more issues which it would cause, with no guarantee that these key areas would be addressed appropriately. It seems irresponsible for Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies to consider large scale developments without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: John A. Horne
Address: Weeley, Essex, CO16

Addendum: I would suggest that, those submitting planning applications, know that the Planning Authorities, Road authorities and Police are incapable of guaranteeing implementation and resolution of the adverse transport impacts once planning approval is granted. There appears to be no will in these authorities to do so.
29th August 2016

Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document
(July 2016)

I object to the proposals for Weele as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weele

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Maningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weele, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weele a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

Paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken-up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.

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 my 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 and this is without the additional traffic which will be created by developments proposed for other areas that will also need to join these already overwhelmed roads.

**Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016)**

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weeley would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and possibly St Andrews Road and Second Avenue. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weeley on a daily procession.

Then the B1441 has a similar problem with traffic coming from Clacton-on-Sea, Great Clacton and Little Clacton. Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at almost a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weeley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weeley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Then come the evening it is the same again and if you are trying to return home along the A120 you will often have to start queuing as you make your way up the slip road.

How can it be considered sensible to build in an area where at present the roads cannot cope with the capacity of cars and so to build another 1,500 to 2,000 houses, which would result in an increase of traffic in the region of 3,000 to 4,000 cars is definitely unsustainable. Further-more the National Policy Statement for National Networks – December 2014 states the following:
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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.

Strategic Part 1 - Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) page 21

4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring.

Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within reasonable walking distance. The frequency of the bus and rail service is limited with mostly one train per hour, no service on a Sunday and no direct route to London or Norwich. So in my opinion they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable. The developments would fall against the social role set out in Paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and its Core Principle of making the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and would be contrary to Policy CP1 and CP2. The proposal should therefore not constitute sustainable development.
Infrastructure includes services, like education; the criteria required is flawed as one of the reasons Weeley was identified as a Key Rural Area for development is because of the misapprehension that Weeley has a Primary School, which in fact is not the case as indicated in the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) - Page 218 C30 Map 33 Weeley. Weeley village also does not have any facilities in the way of medical healthcare with there being neither doctors’ or dentists’ surgeries and so any developments would have to not just say that there would be a possibility of these services being provided but would need to deliver in order to comply with the Policy SP4.

The current situation for healthcare is already being stretched beyond its limits with a long wait for Doctors appointments, due to the fact that the two surgeries that provide care for Weeley residents are both at full capacity. So would not able to accommodate the number of people that would result from all the proposed developments not just here in Weeley, but also in Great Bentley, Thorpe, Kirby to name a few. Colchester Hospital is also being expected to deal with an ever increasing level of demands on its staff and services, whilst at the same time having to find ways to reduce the amount of expenditure due to the Trust’s current financial situation.

I would have thought that before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more, like sewage, flooding, the loss of natural habitat, the loss of fertile agricultural land and the potential increased threat to residents and car drivers. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: ___________________________________________ Signature: __________________________

Address: ___________________________________________ WEELEY, ESSEX

CO16
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley
By Planning Services

The Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government
March 2016

Page 7 – Eligibility criteria

12. To be considered for government support under this section of the prospectus, proposals for a new garden village must meet the following criteria:

SIZE

13. For the purposes of this prospectus, we are defining garden villages, to include proposals that are not eligible under our existing offer, which is restricted to new towns and cities of over 10,000 homes. Therefore, to be eligible under this section of the prospectus, proposals must be for a new settlement of 1,500 – 10,000 homes.

Free-standing settlement

14. The garden village must be a new discrete settlement, and not an extension of an existing town or village. This does not exclude proposals where there are already a few existing homes.

Local leadership and community support

17. New garden villages should have the backing of the local authorities in which they are situated. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate a strong local commitment to delivery. They should also set how the local community is being, or will be, engaged at an early stage, and strategies for community involvement to help ensure local support.

Page 8

Local demand

21. It is important that new garden villages are built as a response to meeting housing needs locally. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate how the new settlement is part of a wider strategy to secure the delivery of new homes to meet assessed needs.

Page 9

Infrastructure

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.

The developments proposed for Weeley whilst all together they may amount to new homes in the region of 2,500 to 3,000, they cannot be considered as a new Garden Village as set by the The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government – March 2016. For the following reasons:
1. The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities clearly states that for a new village to be considered it must adhere to **Point 13 Size**, which states that in order to be considered as a Garden Village the minimum number of homes required to fulfil this requirement is 1,500 and not 800 to 1,100 as discussed by the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) and previous versions of the Local Plan in land allocated south of the railway line running along beside the Weeley Bridge Caravan Leisure Park and up to the Bowling Green Roundabout.

2. The area designated for the development of this new village cannot in my opinion be considered to be far enough away from the current village of Weeley to be fulfilling the requirement of **Point 14 Free-standing settlement**, due to its close proximity to houses on the opposite side of the B1441 Clacton Road and Weeley By-Pass. I do not classify a space that is equal to approximately 100 metres as qualifying as being considered sufficient to enable for this development to be called a Free-standing Settlement contrary to what is the government’s requirements.

3. In my opinion the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) does not lend itself to assisting the community in being able to be involved, as the document provides no actual information as to the amount of development proposed for the designated sites and fails to engage the reader, or assist them in being able to express an honest response to the document. It has been written purely for the benefit of the Local Council and Planning Committee without any real consideration for the general public.

4. **Page 8 - Local demand**

   Whilst there may be a requirement for new homes as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and also in Policy SP1 in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016), which promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development that performs an economic, social and environmental role.

   It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley are clearly not required by the residents of Weeley and that contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village which dates back to the Doomsday Book. The level of development that is being proposed for a village with less than 500 houses would result in an increase in the size of the village in the region of 300%, I do not know how this kind of increase can be deemed as acceptable. For what is a rural settlement the scale of development proposed is in my opinion considerably too large to represent a sustainable, fair and proportionate increase in housing stock and would conflict with, and undermine, the core planning principle as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework to make fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and the need to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

5. **Page 9 - Infrastructure**
29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.

It is in my opinion that infrastructure is one of the reasons that the District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document and previous local plans have selected Weeley because we are considered to be a Key Rural Service – Adopted Local Plan (2007) or an Expanded Settlement as on Page 65/67 Policy SPL 1 Managing Growth of the District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document 2016, as we are close to road networks and have a railway station, these perceived ideas are actually flawed for the following reasons:

Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weeley would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and St Andrews Road. These roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weeley on a daily procession.

Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weeley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weeley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Evenings it’s the same along the A120 with cars often have to queue from the slip road and all the way back into Clacton and Weeley.

The Local Plan for Weeley is not sustainable and is in breach of many of the Local Plan Policies and the National Planning Policy Framework, the developments would be contrary to Policy Q12, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focused Changes and Policies CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016)
Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

Paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.

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 my 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 and this is without the additional traffic which will be created by developments proposed for other areas that will also need to join these already overwhelmed roads.

Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016)

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weeley would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and possibly St Andrews Road and Second Avenue. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weeley on a daily procession.

Then the B1441 has a similar problem with traffic coming from Clacton-on-Sea, Great Clacton and Little Clacton. Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at almost a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weeley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weeley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Then come the evening it is the same again and if you are trying to return home along the A120 you will often have to start queuing as you make your way up the slip road.

How can it be considered sensible to build in an area where at present the roads cannot cope with the capacity of cars and so to build another 1,500 to 2,000 houses, which would result in an increase of traffic in the region of 3,000 to 4,000 cars is definitely unsustainable. Further-more the National Policy Statement for National Networks – December 2014 states the following:
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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.
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4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to how are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring.

Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within reasonable walking distance. The frequency of the bus and rail service is limited with mostly one train per hour, no service on a Sunday and no direct route to London or Norwich. So in my opinion they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable. The developments would fail against the social role set out in Paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and its Core Principle of making the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and would be contrary to Policy CP1 and CP2. The proposal should therefore not constitute sustainable development.
Infrastructure includes services, like education; the criteria required is flawed as one of the reasons Weeley was identified as a Key Rural Area for development is because of the misapprehension that Weeley has a Primary School, which in fact is not the case as indicated in the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) - Page 218 C30 Map 33 Weeley. Weeley village also does not have any facilities in the way of medical healthcare with there being neither doctors’ or dentists’ surgeries and so any developments would have to not just say that there would be a possibility of these services being provided but would need to deliver in order to comply with the Policy SP4.

The current situation for healthcare is already being stretched beyond its limits with a long wait for Doctors appointments, due to the fact that the two surgeries that provide care for Weeley residents are both at full capacity. So would not able to accommodate the number of people that would result from all the proposed developments not just here in Weeley, but also in Great Bentley, Thorpe, Kirby to name a few. Colchester Hospital is also being expected to deal with an ever increasing level of demands on its staff and services, whilst at the same time having to find ways to reduce the amount of expenditure due to the Trust’s current financial situation.

I would have thought that before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more, like sewage, flooding, the loss of natural habitat, the loss of fertile agricultural land and the potential increased threat to residents and car drivers. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: [Redacted] Signature: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
I object to the proposals for Weele, as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weele.

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weele is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%. Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weele, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weele a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weele, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weele and Weele Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weele and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
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.

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.

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 my 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 and this does not include the additional traffic which will be caused through the developments proposed in Thorpe Kirby, Clacton to name just a few.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Policy Planning Manager / Chairman of the Planning Committee
Tendring District Council, Council Offices,
Thorpe Road, Weeley
Clacton-on-Sea
Essex CO16 9AJ

Objection to the Proposed Local Plan (Weeley/TDC)

- **Policy SP3 - Sustainable Design** states that “All new development should make a positive contribution to the quality of the local environment and PROTECT or enhance local character.” I consider that the proposed development would in fact detract, harm and be highly detrimental to this policy due to the size and number & density of buildings proposed.

- **Policy HP 2...Green spaces...** the size of the proposal would be most detrimental to our green spaces locally, with certain destruction of a wide range of habitat, trees, hedgerows and walkways.

- **Weeley** is an old village that needs to retain its history, also its status as a village...the current size of Weeley is already increasing with “natural expansion” i.e. current local smaller building schemes. Therefore further larger housing schemes would be inappropriate and detrimental especially with regard to local our “well being and health aspects” where a vast majority of residents are older people. Local capacity is already being exceeded.

- **Policy PPL3...Our Rural Landscape** would be irreversibly ruined. We in Weeley value our local “Open Countryside” and this would be harmed if this proposal gets the go ahead. Some local rural “lanes” appear to be proposed access points to parts of new estates causing considerable and irreversible harm also damage to the local scene.

Signed... [Redacted]
Address... [Redacted]
Date... 14/9/2016

Weeley post code... CO16...
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%. Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weeley and Weeley Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weeley and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally: paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
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.

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.

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 Weele 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 my 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.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name .................................................. Signature ..................................................

Address .......................................................... WEELEST

.......................................................... CO16
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) – Section 4.3.6 Air Quality and Noise

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weeley once you build 2000+ houses. We already have to deal with an ever increasing level of traffic through the village, which every morning and evening come peak times comes to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

The National Policy Statement for National Networks (December 2014) states the following:

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.

- 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.

- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.

- 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.

Point 2.18 The pressure on the road network is forecast to increase with economic growth, substantial increases in population and a fall in the cost of the car travel from fuel efficiency improvements.

Policy QL2 in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007 the adopted Local Plan) states that:

“All new development proposals should be located and designed to avoid reliance on the use of the private car and promote travel choice other than in exceptional circumstances. Permission will not be granted for development if it is not accessible by a choice of means of transport. Where necessary, measures to improve accessibility of development will be required (from the developer), particularly access by walking, cycling and public transport”.

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.
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.

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.
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4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring. Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highways Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within a reasonable walking distance, the frequency of the bus and rail service is limited and they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable and so therefore contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focussed Changes and Policy CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: BLAKE DAVIES
Address: WEELEY, ESSEX CO16

Signature: 

Date: 21st August 2016
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%.

Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories for of settlements:

- Strategic Urban Settlements
- Smaller Urban Settlements
- Expanded Settlements
- Rural Service Centres; and
- Smaller Rural Settlements

On page 18 – 3. Establishing the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy; Paragraph 4 explains how settlements could be capable of accommodating strategic growth (i.e. larger developments of 700 or more dwellings with integrated schools and other services and facilities), the first step is to carefully assess each settlement by looking at the size of settlement and their relative accessibility to jobs, shops, services and public transport, the existing characteristics and function of each settlement and the requirements of the national planning policy.

On page 19 – Rural Settlements; it clearly states that growth where possible ought to reflect size and relative accessibility of that settlement. There then follows’ 2 calculations to establish how each rural settlement scores and in both results it clearly shows that Weeley does not score the highest score. Yet in comparison with other villages in relation to size and accessibility you choose to ignore these results, and instead of considering to do developments that are comparable to these results, you reach the conclusion that this methodology does not apply to Weeley.

On page 27 you indicate that Weeley has a primary school but in actual fact going by the map C.30 Map 33 Weeley; the school is actually not in the boundary for Weeley but is in fact included in Map C.31 Map 34 Weeley Heath. So the table on Page 27 of the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy should be as follows:

<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>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weele does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

On page 65 of the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) Paragraph 2.8.1.2 Smaller Urban Settlements:

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals / Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weele, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weele a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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.

The proposed developments as well as being in my opinion a Mass Over-development in a small village also fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weele, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in Weele and Weele Heath) clearly are not required by the residents of Weele and contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, it would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village that dates back to the Doomsday Book.

Finally; paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions, to take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

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.

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.
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 Weele 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 my 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.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: BLAKE DAVIES
Address: .......................... WEELEY, ESSEX, CO16 ..........................
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

For the following reasons as explained in conjunction with the relevant paragraphs:

**The Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government March 2016**

**Page 7 – Eligibility criteria**

12. To be considered for government support under this section of the prospectus, proposals for a new garden village must meet the following criteria:

**SIZE**

13. For the purposes of this prospectus, we are defining garden villages, to include proposals that are not eligible under our existing offer, which is restricted to new towns and cities of over 10,000 homes. Therefore, to be eligible under this section of the prospectus, proposals must be for a new settlement of 1,500 – 10,000 homes.

**Free-standing settlement**

14. The garden village must be a new discrete settlement, and not an extension of an existing town or village. This does not exclude proposals where there are already a few existing homes.

**Local leadership and community support**

17. New garden villages should have the backing of the local authorities in which they are situated. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate a strong local commitment to delivery. They should also set how the local community is being, or will be, engaged at an early stage, and strategies for community involvement to help ensure local support.

**Page 8**

**Local demand**

21. It is important that new garden villages are built as a response to meeting housing needs locally. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate how the new settlement is part of a wider strategy to secure the delivery of new homes to meet assessed needs.

**Page 9**

**Infrastructure**

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.

The developments proposed for Weeley whilst all together they may amount to new homes in the region of 2,500 to 3,000, they cannot be considered as a new Garden Village as set by the The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government – March 2016. For the following reasons:
1. The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities clearly states that for a new village to be considered it must adhere to **Point 13 Size**, which states that in order to be considered as a Garden Village the minimum number of homes required to fulfil this requirement is 1,500 and not 800 to 1,100 as discussed by the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) and previous versions of the Local Plan in land allocated south of the railway line running along beside the Weeley Bridge Caravan Leisure Park and up to the Bowling Green Roundabout.

2. The area designated for the development of this new village cannot in my opinion be considered to be far enough away from the current village of Weeley to be fulfilling the requirement of **Point 14 Free-standing settlement**, due to its close proximity to houses on the opposite side of the B1441 Clacton Road and Weeley By-Pass. I do not classify a space that is equal to approximately 100 metres as qualifying as being considered sufficient to enable for this development to be called a Free-standing Settlement contrary to what is the government’s requirements.

3. In my opinion the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) does not lend itself to assisting the community in being able to be involved, as the document provides no actual information as to the amount of development proposed for the designated sites and fails to engage the reader, or assist them in being able to express an honest response to the document. It has been written purely for the benefit of the Local Council and Planning Committee without any real consideration for the general public.

4. **Page 8 - Local demand**

   Whilst there may be a requirement for new homes as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and also in Policy SP1 in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016), which promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development that performs an economic, social and environmental role.

   It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley are clearly not required by the residents of Weeley and that contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village which dates back to the Doomsday Book.

   The level of development that is being proposed for a village with less than 500 houses would result in an increase in the size of the village in the region of 300%, I do not know how this kind of increase can be deemed as acceptable. For what is a rural settlement the scale of development proposed is in my opinion considerably too large to represent a sustainable, fair and proportionate increase in housing stock and would conflict with, and undermine, the core planning principle as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework to make fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and the need to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

5. **Page 9 - Infrastructure**

   29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.
It is in my opinion that infrastructure is one of the reasons that the District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document and previous local plans have selected Weeley because we are considered to be a Key Rural Service – Adopted Local Plan (2007) or an Expanded Settlement as on Page 65/67 Policy SPL 1 Managing Growth of the District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document 2016, as we are close to road networks and have a railway station, these perceived ideas are actually flawed for the following reasons:

Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity

Development must be supported by provision of infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified to serve the needs arising from new development.

The following are strategic priorities for infrastructure provision or improvements within the strategic area:

- Improved road infrastructure aimed at reducing congestion and providing more reliable journey times along the A12, A120 and A133 to improve access to markets and suppliers for business, widen employment opportunities and support growth.
- Provide sufficient school places in the form of expanded or new primary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that essential healthcare infrastructure is provided as part of new developments of appropriate scale in the form of expanded or new doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries.

The developments proposed for Weeley would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road and St Andrews Road. These roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. The B1033 has to deal with all the traffic that makes its way to the A133, from Walton-on-the-Naze, Frinton-on-Sea, Kirby-le-Soken and Thorpe to name just a few of the villages that have to come through Weeley on a daily procession.

Whenever there is a road accident on the A133 or other surrounding roads it causes traffic to be at a standstill and trying to exit out onto either the B1441 or the B1033 via The Street, Weeley is made almost impossible. At peak times the A133 becomes one long traffic jam with cars trying to join from Weeley via the B1033 onto the A133 heading towards Frating having to jostle with the traffic that is making its way along the A133 from Clacton at the Bowling Green Roundabout. Evenings it’s the same along the A120 with cars often have to queue from the slip road and all the way back into Clacton and Weeley.

The Local Plan for Weeley is not sustainable and is in breach of many of the Local Plan Policies and the National Planning Policy Framework, the developments would be contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focused Changes and Policies CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).