29 August 2016

Comments on Local Plan

Dear Sir

I have looked at the detailed local plan and a number of the comments received following the consultation in 2015.

My main concern about the proposals is the proposed development of Weeley Garden Village.

It is essential that the estimated number of houses required in the area over the lifetime of the plan is constantly reviewed – probably annually – as this figure has already been altered – several times - during the lifetime of the Draft Plan. I maintain that these projected figures may not be a true indication of what will be required and if, as suggested in some correspondence; they are arrived at by allowing for London overspill that is not helpful in a rural community with little transport and a lack of local employment.

Already in Weeley Heath a number of landowners and residents have gained permission to build properties on their land. They include Kidby’s Nurseries and Mill Lane Pig Farm as well several smaller developments along Clacton Road, Mill Lane and Rectory Road and total over 100 houses. These I gather are in addition to those mentioned in the Local Plan.

A large development has already been started next to Weeley Council Offices, which I gather is included in the plan.

This means that the number of residents in Weeley and Weeley Heath is likely to have increased by over 10% before the Local Plan is actually agreed.

These additional properties will already put a strain on the already overloaded facilities such as schools, health services, water supplies, sewerage and roads.

The Plan presupposes jobs will be created, all forms of transport will be improved, health services will be increased (despite the lack of funding in the NHS and the unwillingness of GPs to move to our area), new schools will be built, public amenities will be enhanced, broadband will be faster, water supplies and sewage will be improved BEFORE any building is approved. This has clearly not happened here: with the additional houses that already have permission St Andrews School is unlikely to cope with the young children who are likely to move in, the nearest GP practice is at Great Bentley, there is one small shop in the village, buses and trains only run hourly and the congestion on the A133 at Weeley roundabout and on the stretch of road to Frating will get worse.
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, tractor 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: **Bluie Davies**

Address: .......................... .......................... .......................... 

**Essex C016**

**Added:** Please note that the name and address are redacted for privacy reasons. The signature is also redacted for confidentiality.
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 ................................................. WE66 87

ESSEX 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.

Strategic Part I - 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 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: WEENEY, ESSEX CO16

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 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 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.

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

............................................................

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 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).
To whom it may concern,

Please find attached our comments regarding the "Tendring Local Plan", please can you make record of our comments.

Thank you.

Gary Peal and Lucy Spooner
To Whom It May Concern,

We object to the local plan, specifically to mass building in 2 locations – Weeley and Clacton On Sea (Map ref C.6 Part A, C.7 Part B & C30)

We object for the following reasons:

**Mass Building:**
Both locations we believe are being overdeveloped, taking the majority of the housing need and not being fairly distributed over all Tendring parishes. This in effect would be haemorrhaging 2 neighbouring areas with the following implications:

**Roads:**
Both roads are serviced by the A133, especially the section connecting Clacton On Sea to Weeley. This road has seen many fatalities, with records of 5 fatalities in 10 months as of March 2016. There have been concerns by councillors to address this. Improvements of roads are part of the plan, but there has to be an emphasis on greater safety. If more housing were to be built within the areas concerned this would greatly add load to the A133. Adding extra housing without observance to the fact of the fatal nature of this road, would lead to greater risks to all road users.

The Little Clacton Road is another intersecting road regarding the allocated land of Clacton On Sea- especially C6 Part A. This is also known to be a dangerous road, with the last accident being on 18/8/16. This is due to the nature of the S bend that links Clacton On Sea the Progress Way roundabout. Another accident this year saw a car going into a resident’s house on the new Blenheim Gate/St Johns Gate development.

By mass building on the 2 areas mentioned, we believe it would overload one aspect of Tendring in regards to road use.

**Services:**
Tendring is known to be at crisis point in regards to GP surgeries. In addition, services at Clacton Hospital have been greatly slashed. By increasing housing stock, more residents will have to be serviced by the neighbouring hospital, Colchester General, which has been in special measures. Regardless of where housing is being built in Tendring, the healthcare crisis within the area has to be addressed. More surgeries would need to be built and Clacton Hospital’s services would need to increase. Failure of this would compromise the welfare of Tendring residents, especially with the consideration that Tendring’s population is older than the National Average for an area.

Locally, there is a growing shortage of school places already for Clacton. This again is a point that needs to be addressed now for the existing residents, prior to
any housing plan. By increasing housing stock, again this would only add to the disparity between population and school places.

Jobs:
Clacton On Sea has a higher unemployment rate than the National Average. Attempts have been made to regenerate the town centre, with little effect. There have been concerns about the need for jobs for some time. Bringing business to Clacton can only be a positive. However, by bringing mass housing along with it, would only lead to greater disparity regarding the need for jobs, enterprise and employment. A large proportion of Tendring residents travel outside of Tendring for work. The vision of “short distances to travel for employment” would be welcomed, but this has to be for the existing people first, as this need is already present without more housing being built and the populous of Tendring increasing. By building houses at Weeley as an addition, would only enhance the need for jobs.

Rural:
Tendring is a majority rural and coastal area. By mass building at Weeley, it stops being a village and becomes urbanised. It greatly affects its rural nature. In comparison to the local plan, other villages are categorized as having less proportionate house building being allocated. We cannot see why Weeley cannot fall into this status, as they have the same needs and concerns as other smaller villages. Clacton on Sea is surrounded by agricultural land. By mass building outside of Clacton, this directly affects Little Clacton and the rural aspect of the outskirts of Clacton, again urbanising this area. It is not a sympathetic allocation to its rural surroundings.

Conclusion:
We do not believe the distribution of housing is fair. All of Tendring could take a share of the housing need. On estimation, 11,000 houses divided by approximately 30 parishes in Tendring would mean each area taking approximately 370 houses each. This would mean every area/parish would keep its rural aspect, there would be green gaps between all villages, no area is being overloaded with housing. The traffic load would be more dispersed, instead of being overloaded at one point between Clacton and Weeley via the A133. By evenly distributing housing, it would be more in sympathy to Tendring and its rural feel. The impact on one concentrated aspect of agricultural land would be dissipated and evenly shared throughout the district. In addition, places like Horsley Cross, which has great access to the A120, could also take some of the housing load, reducing the average housing need further between each parish. Clacton On Sea and Harwich would be best served by business and enterprise, rather than housing, to make these more welcoming areas for Tendring residents to work and to fulfill the vision of “short trips to work”. We are not against more houses being built, but they should be evenly distributed across the district and services should be addressed for existing residents prior to these aforementioned houses being built.

Yours Sincerely
Mr. G Peal & Miss L Spooner
Tendring Residents
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

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 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 Denyer
Address: 
Signature: [Redacted]
Date: 23 April 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 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 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 eve: 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**

- **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 **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.
Tending Council,
local Plan.

Dear Sirs,

I feel strongly that large mass developments of over 200 are unattractive and in such areas as Weeley Roundabout would give an unattractive view of the area — giving an impression of low-end mass housing estates.

However, such areas as the Pig Farm, and Hittle Clacton are softer, with this in mind I feel our land at Barnfields nos. 1 & 2 Barnfields along with Tudor Lodge would be ideal as the area sits behind houses and is currently pasture and so little damage to the natural environment would be necessary. The land at No 2 literally meets up
with the land at Kidby’s. This site is between both roads into Clacket and would enable the population to fill the Village School at St. Andrews and to return it and encourage the village schools as their catchment could be filled from local children.

The sites of 2 Barnfields and Tudor lodge have good access to the road with a clear view of traffic in each direction.

This site could be developed without any alteration to the landscape as none of it is visible from either roads and this would make it a very attractive and desirable area to live with family homes with gardens for children to play in safely.

No 2 Barnfields also has an access road which runs back between Dicket Bush and Orchard House.

We very much look forward to discussing this opportunity further with you.

Regards
Received On
21st August 2016
Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document
(July 2016) 30 Aug 2016

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

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 come 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 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 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: Vicki Armstrong
Address: Weeley

[Signature]

[Handwritten Address]
Catherine Bicknell
Tendring District Council
Weeleby.

Dear Catherine Bicknell,

Having received 3 communications from you. Feel I should reply!

A Weeleby resident since 1953 — residing in my eighties with difficult mobility and no internet connections. Experiencing the ever growing increase in population and traffic.

Absolutely appalled and strongly object to the development plans for Weeleby. Already the school is full, fewer Doctors or the Great Bentley surgery, with a 3-week wait for appointments and Colchester bound roads are long traffic jams. Where are the jobs coming from? The South East is already too full!
Does the government, or even the local government, take any notice of public opinion.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

(Dione Page R.W.A.)
Dear Sirs,

Objection to Proposed Local Plan

Pays £1,400 per annum Council Tax, yet sees no improvements to the village, potholes and other matters not addressed properly, including flooding of areas adjacent to property.

Yours faithfully

Mr T Greenwald
Objection to the Proposed Local Plan (Weeley/TDC)

- I believe that Weeley has already provided its sufficient quota of new houses as even more buildings are already planned outside of the "proposed" plan.
- Local facilities are already over stretched especially schools, doctors surgeries and pharmacies. The local railway is just a local service with one local train per hour and NONE at all on a Sunday-no ticket facilities at all and just a basic car park. Main roads are blocked at most times especially near roundabouts...ALL other nearby villages need to access our through roads to travel through to the coast OR to Colchester& London directions, hence the pinch points are HERE already IF even more houses are built this would make all journeys even more perilous and even more difficult to get to or from work or school.
- There is little or no real employment locally and it will not be practical to introduce such places due to the really poor local transport & other infrastructure.
- Agricultural work is the only local employment as such, therefore using agricultural land to build on is both unwise and detrimental to local work, also we will be needing crops/locally grown produce for the future therefore loss agricultural land would mean losing our only really local assets.
- Local flooding is already a problem and even more hard surfaces/ built on ground would surely exacerbate that situation.

Signed: T. J. Greenwald
Address: 44 Second Ave, Weeley. Post code: CO16 9HX
Date: 20/8/16
North Essex Strategic Plan
and
Tendring District Local Plan

Preferred Options Consultation

REPRESENTATION FORM

IMPORTANT NOTICE

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

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

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

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

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

Please complete your details and those of your agent, if applicable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Agent's Name: (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR TERRY GREENWALD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS CHRISSIE GREENWALD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent's address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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

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

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

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

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

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

| Part of document | Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation |
### PART 2 PLAN: TENDRING DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PREFERRED OPTIONS

#### SUSTAINABLE PLACES

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

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

#### VISION & OBJECTIVES

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

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

#### HEALTHY PLACES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HP4 improving health &amp; wellbeing</strong></td>
<td>We are fully in support of Tendring's decision to work with the NHS to deliver a service for the residents of Tendring, but not at the expense of new housing development. New housing will help the area with improving the service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVING PLACES</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP1: Housing Supply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP2: Housing Choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP3: Housing Density and Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP4: Housing Layout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP5: Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP6: Rural Exception Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP7: Self-Build Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP8: Backland Residential Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP9: Traveller Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP10: Care and Assisted Living</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LP11: Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) &amp; Bedsits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of document</td>
<td>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP3</td>
<td>We would support an improvement in the local provision of shops and provision of banking services but not at the expense of new housing development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROTECTED PLACES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPL1 and PPL5</td>
<td>Due to current flooding issues and the land sloping towards the houses there is a problem of flooding in the area. Also, the drains are blocked and causes flooding. New housing development will exacerbate the current problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CONNECTED PLACES**

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

**POLICIES MAPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.30 Weeley</td>
<td>Land south of Weeley council offices. Several break-ins in last property. Worried that if development encloses/ surrounds property there would be an increase of crime and break-ins as in the last property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of document</th>
<th>Reasons for Objection or proposed Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>We would like to see safety improvements made to the A133 between the Elmstead Marquet Roundabout and the Weeley Roundabout. An increase to two lanes of the A133 and route direction of traffic coming into the Elmstead Roundabout so left lane traffic goes towards Weeley and right lane traffic goes towards Elmstead. Better road marking required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak bridge at Weeley cannot take increase in heavy vehicle usage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2 – Any other comments

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

C.30: Weoley. Worried about all the new housing development devaluing their property and future sale possibilities due to newer properties being more attractive.

C.30: We would accept the west of Weoley to be developed but not the land north of the land south of the Weoley Council offices. We feel this would be over-development of the area.

We feel that transport access provision is better to the west than to the east.

Date: 19.08.16.
Signature: [Redacted]

Thank you for your comments.

The Council will consider all responses before preparing its Submission Development Plan Document.
To whom it may concern.

Having visited a recent exhibition held at the Council Chamber in Weeley concerning the possible development of the Tendring area, I am writing to air my objections to the proposed scheme in Weeley.

Weeley is at present, a small village situated in farmland, with a busy 'B' road running through it's heart that takes traffic through to the coastal towns of Frinton and Walton. This road, along with many in the area, weren't designed to take the present amount of traffic, particularly over the summer week-ends, let alone more that will obviously occur owing to more development of the area. Bottlenecks frequently form at the various roundabouts leading to the area, and these will only get worse. What about all the extra exhaust emissions that will spew into the atmosphere, these will no doubt be unhealthy for the residents, many of which are older retirees and families with young children.

I feel that the proposed developments in Weeley, will be totally detrimental to the area and will take away the rural feel to the village, especially as it could quadruple in size! This will in fact, turn it from what is now a relatively quiet village into a small town!

What is proposed for the Weeley 4000 year old prehistoric stone circle that is situated on the land to the north of the village in the heart of the proposed development? Will it be surrounded by a housing estate and lost for future generations? History cannot be replaced!

 Whilst I appreciate the fact that some development is inevitable, the amount planned for Weeley is disproportional to that planned for other areas in Tendring, and is totally unfair to the local residents, many of whom retired here for a quiet and peaceful life in a rural community that will be lost if the extensive, proposed development comes to fruition.

Yours faithfully,

R.J.Noakes (Mrs)

Weeley,
Calcton-on-Sea,
Essex.
CO16 9

From: ros noakes
Sent: 24 August 2016 07:02
To: Planning,policy
Subject: Development of Weeley

To whom it may concern.

Having visited a recent exhibition held at the Council Chamber in Weeley concerning the possible development of the Tendring area, I am writing to air my objections to the proposed scheme in Weeley.

Weeley is at present, a small village situated in farmland, with a busy 'B' road running through it's heart that takes traffic through to the coastal towns of Frinton and Walton. This road, along with many in the area, weren't designed to take the present amount of traffic, particularly over the summer week-ends, let alone more that will obviously occur owing to more development of the area. Bottlenecks frequently form at the various roundabouts leading to the area, and these will only get worse. What about all the extra exhaust emissions that will spew into the atmosphere, these will no doubt be unhealthy for the residents, many of which are older retirees and families with young children.

I feel that the proposed developments in Weeley, will be totally detrimental to the area and will take away the rural feel to the village, especially as it could quadruple in size! This will in fact, turn it from what is now a relatively quiet village into a small town!

What is proposed for the Weeley 4000 year old prehistoric stone circle that is situated on the land to the north of the village in the heart of the proposed development? Will it be surrounded by a housing estate and lost for future generations? History cannot be replaced!

Whilst I appreciate the fact that some development is inevitable, the amount planned for Weeley is disproportional to that planned for other areas in Tendring, and is totally unfair to the local residents, many of whom retired here for a quiet and peaceful life in a rural community that will be lost if the extensive, proposed development comes to fruition.

Yours faithfully,

R.J.Noakes (Mrs)
Weeley,
Calciton-on-Sea,
Essex.
CO16
To whom it may concern.

Having visited a recent exhibition held at the Council Chamber in Weeley concerning the possible development of the Tendring area, I am writing to air my objections to the proposed scheme in Weeley.

Weeley is at present, a small village situated in farmland, with a busy 'B' road running through it's heart that takes traffic through to the coastal towns of Frinton and Walton. This road, along with many in the area, weren't designed to take the present amount of traffic, particularly over the summer week-ends, let alone more that will obviously occur owing to more development of the area. Bottlenecks frequently form at the various roundabouts leading to the area, and these will only get worse. What about all the extra exhaust emissions that will spew into the atmosphere, these will no doubt be unhealthy for the residents, many of which are older retirees and families with young children.

I feel that the proposed developments in Weeley, will be totally detrimental to the area and will take away the rural feel to the village, especially as it could quadruple in size! This will in fact, turn it from what is now a relatively quiet village into a small town!

What is proposed for the Weeley 4000 year old prehistoric stone circle that is situated on the land to the north of the village in the heart of the proposed development? Will it be surrounded by a housing estate and lost for future generations? History cannot be replaced!

Whilst I appreciate the fact that some development is inevitable, the amount planned for Weeley is disproportional to that planned for other areas in Tendring, and is totally unfair to the local residents, many of whom retired here for a quiet and peaceful life in a rural community that will be lost if the extensive, proposed development comes to fruition.

Yours faithfully,

R.J.Noakes (Mrs)
Weeley,
Clacton-on-Sea,
Essex.
CO16
We object to the Local Plan Preferred Options, especially for the OVERDEVELOPMENT OF WEELEY, for the following reasons:-

Para 1.12 Infrastructure & Connectivity. As the A133 is already badly congested at peak times with traffic going to Colchester and beyond in the morning, and returning in the afternoon/evening, and Para 1.17.1 stating the strategy for the A133 is for delivery post 2018/19, surely the better option is to build a greater quantity of homes around the Colchester fringe (see Para 1.24 Cross Boundary Garden Communities) thus negating the extra traffic on the A133.

Para 1.20 Education & Healthcare. Both are already stretched (especially healthcare with it becoming difficult to get a non-urgent doctors appointment within the month!) and this situation will only get worse before any infrastructure improvements are delivered. Surely the infrastructure should be put in place before the situation deteriorates even more.

Para 2.48 states "Major development at Weeley is therefore recommended because of its strategic location at the heart of the District, good transport connections..." The A133 cannot be classed as a good transport connection at peak times (see points raised above).

Para 2.49 states "Weeley village will benefit from the introduction of expanded community facilities, retail and employment space, education and other facilities along with other necessary infrastructure" This WILL NOT benefit Weeley, it will transform it by OVERDEVELOPMENT from a village into a small town - not what most residents of Weeley want or would see as a benefit. If we wanted to live in a town we would not have chosen to live in a village. Weeley should come under the same heading as other villages and "some small-scale development which is sympathetic to the rural and often historic character of the settlement" should apply as in Para 2.53.

Finally the "flyer" you sent out "A New Plan for our District" with exhibition venues and dates states that without an up-to-date Local Plan, "developers can progress schemes which suit them but often not the local community", this is exactly what YOU are proposing to do in respect to Weeley, it may suit you, but it DOES NOT SUIT the Local Community of Weeley!!!

J & P Sparkes
(Residents of Weeley for over 40 years)
Dear Catherine

Online petition objecting to the Proposed Local Plan for Tendring

I notified the council that an online petition had started as above, and my e-mail was acknowledged by William Fuller BA (Hons) MSc on 26th July as follows: ‘Thank you for your enquiry which I received on the 13th July 2016. I apologise for the slight delay in my response to you. The commencement of an online petition is noted and I await the physical copy in due course.’

The petition is now closed, and I attach the physical copy of that petition.

There are a few points to note. Some of those signing the petition are not from the immediate local area, but either work, holiday or otherwise have a family interest about what happens to Weeley. I know from a poll of about 200 residents that only 60% are computer literate, so to have amassed 313 signatures on-line is no mean achievement. Many of the comments were regarding the rural nature of the area and a wish for it to remain that way.

I understand that petitions are not welcomed for the proposed Local Plan, but I would like the Government Inspector to note the strong feelings aroused by this matter, and the sheer number of residents in the Tendring area who are against it.

Yours sincerely
To: Tendring District Council

Save Weeley

Campaign created by Angela Barnes

Take the proposed development sites for Weeley off the Tendring District Council Local Plan as the accessibility criteria on which the scoring of 4/4 is based is fatally flawed. It is serious over-development, and unacceptable to those residing in the area.

Why is this important?

Weeley is a small rural area consisting of 750 dwellings. It appears in the Domesday Book, has a lot of local history, and is comprehensively rural in nature, which is why residents choose to live here. The Tendring District Council proposals will lead to serious over-development of the area, destroying agricultural and natural habitats, and affecting the health and well-being of the existing residential population.
To: Tendring District Council

Take the proposed development sites for Weeley off the Tendring District Council Local Plan as the accessibility criteria on which the scoring of 4/4 is based is fatally flawed. It is serious over-development, and unacceptable to those residing in the area.

Signed by 313 people:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Postcode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angela Barnes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Crane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Rowlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Tweed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Harwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Stock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Bailey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Newman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Bailey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrie Ansell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Stock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Dear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Fuller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlyn Tyrie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Simons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Stovell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Willas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Archer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Garrett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollie Cole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si Helghway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Greenleaf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Bloomfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Flynn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne McCaig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Mills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Greenleaf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy Hurrell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Hickey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Cowland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gordon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorna Mastroberardino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Bray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Ferridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raylea Bastian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Hogarth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Comrie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sian Ellis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Hunt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Farrant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Farrington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Hayhoe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Richardson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith-Daye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Tyrie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody Hicks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Warren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Boniface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Reed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Smith-Daye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Flitney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Rush</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Richardson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Abbott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Harman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Townsend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Bland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Sage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Boneface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Hogarth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Bushby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Godslove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Watts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Caslake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Coleman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Godslove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Hunn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela Schlamkow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Morgan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Defreitas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Weaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirarda Bradford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Cook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Byford-Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Cunningham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Burns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaini Newman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fay Braby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Alexander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwennyth Malbon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodie Rule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliane Foster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Carter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Firth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barrie buck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra-Leigh Parkinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina McCarthy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Barnes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Hopgood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Baird</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Bannister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Garton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam McCarthy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Cooper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Finch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Fisher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darcy Huxham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Zima</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Connelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Finch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Raynor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Finch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee Forsos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Ryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Cosgrove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terisine Tompkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamsin Warren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanne Purcell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Purcell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannan Kerry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Pilgrim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Skinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viktoria DeRoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Bucke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Olley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry Dalton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Kilgour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet McDonald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Barnes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Matute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Matthews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis Skinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Harfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Guernari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Worthy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Forth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Saxana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mas raz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Cole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy stoter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosie Dyvig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest muttock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Debrick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loren Dodds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Duncombe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Carrington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avril Fudge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Duncombe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Spooner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Higgins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Parry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Duncombe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Lewis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Baverstock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Blackman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfie Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Carr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Daly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Malcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Ranson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Arran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Huckle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAINI NEWMAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angharad Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Dumsday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicky Winder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurence Gardiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillian Bonnell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen COE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James COE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Jiggens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Cater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Jiggens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Gates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Kincaid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne Rogers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Campion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Holt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREND A loman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gary loman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive Heightman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Constable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Welch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chia Yen Huang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Anthony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>andrew byford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Botterell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Botterell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layla Botterell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>george bridgen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Viercant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Parsons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecith Boyle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Bergin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garth Gouge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz McDougall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Cruickshank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Schlamkow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Crook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Norton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Hummel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Rooney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Fairbanks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Marrable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Barnes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Mees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Gater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Roonwy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Rooney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry Chambers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Joslin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Golder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Golder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William P Rooney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Carter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyn Ramsey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Zima</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Tooley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Deville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael Hazelton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Hazelton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy Hazelton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Candler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Mcfahn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Healy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Healy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Frizzell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna Frizzell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Healy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Hunt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Alfs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Quirke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Strahan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Playford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Quirke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Tracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Fordham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Davey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Burns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Cauvain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemma Hacking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Bailey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Whitley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Lally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Botterell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Weir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Metcalf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch Cohen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Wotherspoon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Stephen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Biswell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Bowers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hewett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Policy Team
Tendring District Council
Council Offices
Thorpe Road
Weeley
Essex
CO16 9AJ

Dear Sirs

District Local Plan
Preferred Options Consultation Document

I totally object to the proposed plan for Weeley, the accessibility criteria on which the choice of Weeley was made is fatally flawed, in terms of transport and statistics.

The plan for Weeley is completely contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework's statement that it is the purpose of planning to achieve sustainable development - not development at any cost! The plan for Weeley is totally development at any cost, not taking into account residents' objections, lack of infrastructure, loss of natural, rural, and historic environment, and ignoring the fact that a more suitable site along the A120 at Horsley Cross is available, already having been ear-marked for development.

- It is a bizarre and totally flawed action by planners to summarily split the Village and the Heath at the railway line into two entities. We are NOT two, but ONE community. The Heath has the School, the Village Hall, the Church, and the Playing Field on its side of the railway line.... which proves my point without question.
- 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. If developed, where will food come from for all the extra population if this happens country-wide? We cannot afford to lose the land that feeds us. This is therefore CONTRARY to sustainability in my view!
• The threat of the plan is already affecting the health and well-being of the existing population. There is no NHS provision to cover the extra population - you can build all the surgeries you like, but how will it be staffed? Likewise schools and education.
• Motor Transport links are poor, the roads ill-maintained, and the slightest hiccup causes major tailbacks right from the A120 down to Weeley roundabout as it is. An extra 4000 cars is not going to help that situation one little bit! 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. It used to have a barracks here during the Napoleonic Wars, has many ancient houses and farmsteads, World War 2 bunkers. These 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. Many caravan/chalet owners and holiday makers have said to me personally that they 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.

- What is in place to realise that leaving Europe means that demand for housing is going to be re-adjusted? The figures on which the statistics give numbers for housing throughout Tendring are already questionable, and this question means that they really cannot be justified.

I, as a resident of Weeley, love my village and my community, and I do not want to see it destroyed. I ask that my views are properly considered, and that common sense prevails. (Non-existent in planning matters I know)

Yours faithfully

Angela V Barnes
Your planning proposals for Weeley and all points east are unsustainable since you have no firm proposals for upgrading the A133 between the Frating roundabout and the Weeley roundabout. There is no way the present road will cope with the vast increase in traffic resulting from the development. The following quote from your document promises nothing and is therefore meaningless.

For the A133, between Colchester and Clacton, the Council will work with 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.

The planned development for Weeley should be sited off the A120 between Colchester and Harwich where road communications are much better. I think that you plans for Weeley are therefore not properly thought through and I object most strongly.

Ben Clarke
31 Second Avenue
Weeley
Clacton On Sea
Essex
CO16 9HX

5 August 2016

Dear Occupier

Local Plan for Tendring District – Public Consultation

Tendring District Council is preparing a new Local Plan to guide development in the district. The Plan will set out the key development projects that will deliver new jobs, housing and community facilities; specific sites that will be both promoted for and protected from development; the new infrastructure that will be needed to support future growth; and planning policies that the Council will use when determining planning applications.

An up-to-date plan will help the Council to influence the scale, location and quality of development in the District; bring about positive changes and resist inappropriate development proposals.

The Council recently published a draft (Preferred Options) version of the Local plan for consultation. I am writing to you specifically because one of the larger development sites proposed in the draft Plan is located near to the area where you live. You are invited to submit your comments on the Plan to help the Council develop the policies and proposals.
The Plan can be viewed on the Council’s website, there is a banner on the home page which links to the document. The document is also available at local libraries and exhibitions are being held at:

- Tendring Enterprise School, Jaywick Lane, Clacton – Saturday 13th August 10.30am - 2.30pm
- Dovercourt Central Church, Main Rd, Dovercourt – Tuesday 16th August 3pm - 7.30pm
- Council Chamber, Weeley – Friday 19th August 3pm - 7.30pm
- Venture Centre Bromley Rd, Lawford - Monday 22nd August 1.30pm - 6.30pm
- Elmstead Community Centre, School Rd, Elmstead Market - Tuesday 30th August 2.30pm - 6.30pm

Comments on the Plan should be submitted by Thursday 8th September 2016. Following the close of the consultation period, the comments received will be reported to the Council’s Local Plan Committee which will decide what changes to make to the draft Plan before the next version is published, which will be submitted to the Government for examination by an independent Planning Inspector.

If you have questions about the draft Plan after reading the information available on the website or at the exhibitions or libraries, please contact the planning policy team at planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk.

Yours faithfully

Catherine Bicknell

Head of Planning Services

I would love to attend meeting However I have an hos APP

I would like to put forward my concerns about the infrastructure. Such as another GP’s Surgery in Weeley and the jams in Thorpe Rd joining Colchester Rd in and around this area. I haven’t a computer @ Can’t get to the Clacton Library be the bus stops is too far for me to walk. I have to pay £50 for a car to take me to Bentley's GP’s practice which the waiting list is now a month. This is going to become worse so would you send me a future plan

Thank you
The Chief Planning Officer
Tendring District Council
Council Offices
Weeley
Clacton on Sea
Essex

Dear Sir/Madam

Proposed residential development, Crow Lane, Tendring.

I understand that it proposed to include in the Local Development Plan the zoning of land to both sides of the Weeley end of Crow Lane for the possible construction of some 300 dwellings. This is, I understand, in addition to other large areas of land in and around Weeley where it is proposed that residential development should be permitted.

The effect that such large scale development will have upon the local infrastructure, schools, roads etc fills one with dismay. It is only necessary to look at the Colchester bound traffic on the A133 between Weeley and Frating at about 8.00 am to realise that the addition of several hundred houses with many of the occupants travelling daily to work in Colchester and beyond will lead to gridlocked traffic for hours on end. This will be compounded by developments already approved and others in the pipeline in Kirby, Walton and Frinton.

Of particular concern to those of us who live within the Parish of Tendring is the fact that there is likely to be a very heavy increase in the use of the B1035 through Tendring village by traffic avoiding Weeley. This road is totally unsuited to heavy traffic and furthermore Crow Lane itself would almost certainly become a “rat run” for traffic originating in Weeley wishing to access the A120. This lane is dangerous at present with at least two blind corners and any increase in traffic could be lethal.

I entirely accept that houses have to be built somewhere but selecting an area where the infrastructure is totally unsuited and where there is little prospect of local employment seems both unwise and unsustainable.

The coastal towns of Clacton Frinton and Walton have very little full time industrial employment and rely heavily on summer tourism to generate local income. It seems to me that it is counterproductive to build more houses for people who will commute to
Colchester or London for work whilst at the same time destroying the remaining amenities of the coastal towns by making vehicular access difficult if not impossible and covering what little remains of the nearby open countryside with houses.

I sincerely hope that these proposals will be reconsidered and that the amount of land allocated for residential development in Weeley will be very substantially reduced generally while that in Crow Lane will be totally excluded from development.

Yours faithfully,

W F H Gibbon FRICS
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

I hereby object to the following:-

1. The overall number of proposed dwellings are far too excessive for a village the size of Weeley...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. Weeley 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............................................................... post code................................
Date.................................................................
Dear Sirs,

I am an elderly, disabled lady who lives in Weeley Village. I wish to protest against the Tendring District Local Plan.

The plan only thinks about the need for housing and not the effects of that housing on the local communities and necessary services around them. Our green space is being destroyed and villages are being asked to become towns with no consideration to the need for unavailable amenities to support that nor the unavailable finance nor the destruction of an option of a rural way of life. It seems we are ignoring unused brown space on the edges of our towns and randomly destroying our green spaces around villages to line the pockets of greedy builders, landowners and corrupt councillors.

If one chooses to live in a town then one expects facilities, transport, amenities and school places at the expense of quiet and lack of traffic. If one chooses to live in a village then the sacrifice of decent roads, transport and amenities are done in the expectation of a rural setting with quiet and minimal traffic.

Already our village children cannot get places at the local school. Trying to travel anywhere in the village by car or bicycle, on foot or especially in a wheelchair is a nightmare. Construction traffic and temporary traffic lights in Weeley Village and Weeley Heath are causing chaos at the junction with Crow
Lane and near to the Village School. This will only become worse when the contractors move out and the new residents move in.

Our bus and train services are abysmal. We accept that as we chose to live in a village. Please note this. We are being forced, by ex-councillors who do not live here and only want to line their pockets and avoid the building near their own homes, to change our village and heath into a town!

**Crow Lane**

In particular, the proposals for the field in Crow Lane adjoining the local beauty spot/duck pond are appalling. This field is outside the village boundary as is clear by the fact that the speed limit is not restricted until the junction with Crow Lane and Thorpe Road. There is already an issue with traffic (it is a country lane and the road is not maintained with countless pot holes).

This is a plan that will not only alter the character of our own village but set a precedent for the gradual destruction of all our villages and rural way of life in this country. This is not what I want for my beloved grandchildren who also live in the village.

Yours sincerely

Pamela Carline
Dear Sirs,

It is with extreme anger, despair and desperation that we write to appeal against the Tendring District Local Plan.

**Overall Plan for Weeley**

The plan in its entirety is clearly a knee-jerk reaction to what is now an ex-government dictat based on our staying in the European Union. This plan only thinks about the need for housing and not the effects of that housing on the local communities and necessary services around them. Our green space is being destroyed and villages are being asked to become towns with no consideration to the need for unavailable amenities to support that nor the unavailable finance nor the destruction of an option of a rural way of life. It seems we are ignoring unused brown space on the edges of our towns and randomly destroying our green spaces around villages to line the pockets of greedy builders, landowners and corrupt councillors.

If one chooses to live in a town then one expects facilities, transport, amenities and school places at the expense of quiet and lack of traffic. If one chooses to live in a village then the sacrifice of decent roads, transport and amenities are done in the expectation of a rural setting with quiet and minimal traffic.
Already our village children cannot get places at the local school. Trying to travel anywhere in the village by car or bicycle or on foot is a nightmare. Construction traffic and temporary traffic lights in Weeley Village and Weeley Heath are causing chaos at the junction with Crow Lane and near to the Village School. This will only become worse when the contractors move out and the new (doubtless London) residents move in.

There are two holiday parks whose only attraction is that we have a quiet, rural location. Do you wish all the holidaymakers to go elsewhere?

Our bus and train services are abysmal. We accept that as we chose to live in a village. Please note this. We are being forced, by ex-councillors who do not live here and only want to line their pockets and avoid the building near their own homes, to change our village and heath into a town!

Crow Lane

In particular, the proposals for the field in Crow Lane adjoining the local beauty spot/duck pond are appalling. This field is outside the village boundary as is clear by the fact that the speed limit is not restricted until the junction with Crow Lane and Thorpe Road. There is already an issue with traffic (it is a country lane and the road is not maintained with countless pot holes).

We will all fight until the very end, as this is a plan that will not only alter the character of our own village but set a precedent for the gradual destruction of all our villages and rural way of life in this country.

Yours sincerely David, Jo and Jodie Beverley
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in 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 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.

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]
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.

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

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 is 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 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.
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:

oint 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

B.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

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: Tanya Hutching .......................... Signature: ..................................................

Address: .................................................. REAMONT ..........................................................

ESSEX, C7 4G5 ..........................................................
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 28 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 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: Raylea Bostock
Address: [Redacted]
Signature: [Redacted]
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).

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 Weoley 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 ........................................ Signature ........................................
Address ........................................ (Weele) ........................................
Date ........................................
Objection To Building Crow Lane Weeley

STUART BLOOMFIELD

TO WHOM THIS LETTER MAY CONCERN.

Firstly I would like to say that I have lived in Weeley all of my life which is 40 years now, my family from grandparents to parents all lived their lives in Weeley and I now have settled down to raise my family in this beautiful little village. I could go on for ages about what a great quiet little village Weeley is and how most of my school friends have chosen to settle down in Weeley where they grew up and are now raising their families here the same as me, but I better get to the planning points as I think as a whole it is wrong for Weeley.

Whilst I think Weeley has to grow as a village and community and allow for some development, the scale intended for Weeley is totally unfair to the residents and all it takes for Weeley to no longer be a nice little quaint village is one wrong move by the planning committee.

When I attended the council meeting I went to the head of planning Neil Stock and I quote his words "Here said to increase Weeley in this proportion is perverse and unheard of, this happening to another village on this scale."

It seems to me from listening to the comments made at the meeting, Weeley is being used as a scape-goat to get the housing structure in place for this council where it has fallen short over the years and messed up the local plan and if not put in place, being taken out of their hands by the government to fix their mistakes.

It seems Weeley covers all the housing quota problems that they have made and have now put all their eggs in one basket, ie Weeley, no matter how bad the plan is and again I quote Neil Stock "A bad plan is better then no plan." well that's fine for people to say if your not a Weeley resident investing in property and village life with wonderful views and small community values.

While I accept some building in Weeley has to take place, the building being constructed on top of Colchester road and behind the council offices is fair to say natural development. But building in Crow Lane on a dangerous country road with flood problems is the worst place the council could possibly allow to happen, Crow Lane is a quiet road with few houses surrounded by nature and stunning views of natural landscapes that we should be protecting as the nature will be harmed as well and looking at other "areas" where the impact of development is not so great.

Crow Lane is unacceptable and coming on to Crow Lane there are no footpaths apart from the first few houses, minimal lighting and a narrow road with lots of farm vehicles. It is a crazy solution in Weeley and again with more traffic coming out of crow lane and onto Colchester road with the already development being built, it is far to much traffic for that road to cope with regardless of these traffic road surveys, as by living here myself I know that getting out onto Colchester road at various times of the day is very difficult because of the volume of traffic.
Lastly regarding other possible developments in Weeley although I am against them I feel as though the number of houses being built beside the council offices should be sufficient if I had to be honest the McDoanlds area would be the next best and only choice to develop, it would not impact so badly on where people are housed at the minute and it wouldn't really ruin any views people are enjoying having purchased their property. The McDonald area is also close to the train station and within walking distance, close to shops and other various amenities, it has better and safer roads to come in and out on, the lay-out of the land could be designed in a way to fit Weeley as a whole without looking to out of place. Also this area I believe would have buildings for employment etc so Weeley would also get something back as a village but as for the development going on Crow Lane there is no benefit to the community, just a loss. So to me the only thing is if Weeley is to suffer this short fall in housing and bail this area out at least do it fairly and don't ruin a village in one fowl swoop, look at the plan with common sense to what could fit well and see what doesn't, its quite obvious.

Yours Sincerely
Mr S Bloomfield
25th July 2016

Cllr Neil Stock
Room 29, Town Hall
Station Road
Clacton-on-Sea
Essex, CO15 1SE

Dear Cllr Neil Stock,

Please can you explain how it seems that when it comes to the Local Plan and building in consideration for what is already there, plus more importantly in relation to small villages “any building will be modest” that these points are then totally disregarded when it comes to Weeley village.

Weeley village only has about 500 hundred houses and yet TDC see nothing wrong with not just doubling the size, which would have been enough of an insult but have multiplied that by two. TDC’s proposal of building another nearly two thousand houses (plus) with mixed development will not enhance it, it will completely destroy what you classify as an extended village.

There are several buildings which date back to the 16th, 17th and 18th century but in order to suit TDC’s needs these can just be ignored, much like the majority of the residents of Weeley. Your Local Plan goes on and on about how the new developments will be built so as to enhance the quality of life of the people who will live there but what about the people who already live here. TDC show no consideration for us at all.

It would not surprise me for the new developments to have perfect pavements and roads, whilst currently here in Weeley the pavements are a disgrace and any potholes which get reported never meet the criteria in order to be repaired. No thought is given as to the location of the pothole or dangerous pavement and the impact it could have on a motorist, pedestrian or cyclist.

TDC talk about infrastructure and how you are working in collaboration with the necessary bodies but it’s these same organisations who are currently doing nothing to resolve any of the issues in Weeley. Also infrastructure is not just public transport and broadband, which
to be frank the majority of residents are elderly and so it is very low down on their list of priorities. Infrastructure here is drainage which as soon as it rains cannot cope, hence at the bottom of the Street near Willow Walk you have effluence coming up out of the drains, in people's back gardens and the Tarmac rising up. But again until the road collapses we know that nothing will be done.

How long will we have to wait until we get some District Councillors with a bit of common sense and back bone. It does not require a rocket scientist to see that roads which are already very congested will only become much worse once the new houses start being built. It also is obviously apparent that Weeley and other areas in Tendring do not have thousands of people waiting to move into these new homes, and so as much as the council like to believe that we are all idiots and do not realise it, they will not be for local people.

TDC have kindly given all the people of Tendring eight weeks to read the Local Plan and to raise any concerns that they have during that period, but unlike the previous consultation document you do not assist the reader in doing so. There are some people who will not be able to within your remit provide or express an opinion. The previous consultation document asked the reader specific questions which they could answer and so by doing encourage residents to take part.

I do not believe that even if every person in Weeley was to say no to TDC’s Local Plan and gave you their views on the Local Plan that the decisions about Weeley’s future would change. It is convenient and suits your purpose, you will see it as a job well done. Well yes there we do agree, you have done a good job of showing total disrespect as to the welfare of the residents of Weeley.

Furthermore, Weeley and Weeley Heath are one village it is insulting how to suit your purpose you decide to define us as two separate areas. We have always been one village and we will always stay as one village, despite the efforts of TDC to make it otherwise.

In my opinion your Local Plan is flawed and Weeley will fight you all the way.

Yours truly,

Miss Anita Bailey
26th August 2016

By Planning Services

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 documents:

**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**

- 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 out by the The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities – Department for Communities and Local Government – March 2016. So the proposed development for 800 houses with mixed use as indicated on page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley is contrary 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 Weelely 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 the Weeley Bridge Caravan Park which it will have a direct boundary against and also 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.

3. The Locally-Led Garden, Towns and Cities also states 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**. 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**

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.

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. Where local planning authorities are unable to identify a five year supply of deliverable housing sites against objectively assessed future needs, plus an appropriate buffer, policies relating to housing supply are considered out of date and the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies, requiring planning permission to be granted unless any adverse effects of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole.

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley including 108 houses that already have been approved for development in Weeley and Weelely Heath, 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.

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:

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:
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 Weoley 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 Weoley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weoley 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.

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.

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.

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”.

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. 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 QL2 in the adopted Local Plan. The proposal should therefore not constitute sustainable development.

Infrastructure includes services, like education and as explained above; 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.

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.
Dear Sirs,

I wish to comment on the above proposed plan and the adverse effects it will have on the village of Weeley and Weeley Heath. The current number of houses in the village is approximately 750 and proposed development would more than double this number, thus overloading the current road structure and local facilities.

This development is not wanted by the vast majority of local residents, myself included who would view this as destroying the village and it's environment. Please reconsider this plan and remove Weeley from the impending urbanisation of our village.

D J Newman
Weeley Heath
Clacton
Essex
CO16 [REDACTED]
July 22/2016

The Planning Policy Manager
Tendring District Council.

Dear Sir,

Proposed Development in Weeley/Heath.
I beg you to think carefully and responsibly before allowing adoption of the local plan for Weeley, Weeley Heath.

We are an island nation and our greenfields are as an important part of our landscape as is our coastline.

The countryside is our heritage and the Green Belt was introduced to protect our villages from urban development. It protects the character of England’s rural communities and provides respite for those who live and work in towns and cities in the way of walking, cycling, camping, equestrian pursuits etc.

There is already ongoing development in this village, a creeping enlargement around our edges.

Please do not allow this huge development to go ahead; it is an appalling manner for the village to grow and will...
most definitely change it beyond all recognition. If you as planning officers pass these plans you will become the destroyers of that which makes our countryside a precious place.

Please uphold the values of the Green Belt; it performs a protection for wildlife and plants and gives urban dwellers access to country pursuits and protects the character of our rural community. Once lost it cannot be regained.

Once again, please think responsibly on our behalf. To pass these proposals will be as a criminal act against a small and happy community.

Please say no.

Yours faithfully,

Julia M. A. Syrett.
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. Results show 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:

- 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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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 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: JULIA M.A. SYRESI

Address: WEELEY HEATH, CO16...
Weeley,

CO16

19th July 2016

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to protest most strongly against the Local Plan for housing in Weeley. When we moved here nearly 20 years ago it was because of the nature of the environment and location of our property which we had worked for all our working life. Now it would seem this will change drastically and Weeley is to be converted into a suburb of London irrespective of residents wishes and to the detriment of local services. Currently you are looking at 3 weeks waiting to see a doctor indeed in some areas doctors are having problems maintaining current practices let alone starting new ones.

Neighbours are having difficulty in getting their children into local schools and again schools are having difficulty recruiting teachers so new schools will only have major problems in this area.

Road infrastructure is only just managing to cope with current levels of traffic so one can only imagine what chaos a thousand new properties will bring.

One further suggestion why bother scattering new properties around Weeley when there is a perfect solution where all the properties can be contained in one area, build on Bentley Green. But this will never happen as there are too many people living there with money and we all know that talks! It is noticeable that, although this doesn’t come within your remit, Great Bentleys roads are resurfaced with tarmac whereas ours are resurfaced with chippings! Yet another example of inequality in today’s life.

Yours faithfully,

Mr and Mrs D Anthony.
TO WHOM THIS LETTER MAY CONCERN..

Firstly Id like to say I have lived in Weeley all my life some 40 years now my whole family from parents to grandparents all lived there lives in Weeley and I now have settled down to bring my family up in this beautiful little village. I could go on for ages about what a great quite village Weeley is and how most of my school friends all choose to settle down in Weeley where they grew up and now bring there families up here same as me but I better to get to the planning points and bits I think is wrong for Weeley as a whole.

While I think Weeley has to grow as a village and community and allow for some development the scale intended for Weeley is totally unfair to the residents and in one move by the planning commitee Weeley ceases to exist as a nice quaint little village is ruined FOR EVER.

In the council meeting I went to the head of planning Neil Stock and I quote his words here said to increase Weeley in this proportion is perverse and unheard of this happening to another village on this scale its seems to me from listening to the comments made at the meeting Weeley is being used as scape goat to get the housing structure in place for this council where it has fallen short over the years and messed up the local plain and if not put in place being taken out there hands by the government to fix there mistakes so it seems to me Weeley covered all the housing quaterproblems that they have made and have now put all there eggs one one basket ie Weeley no matter how bad the plan is and again I quote Neil Stock a bad plan is better then no plan well that's fine for people to say if your not a Weeley resident investing in operty and village life with wonderful views and a small community values.

While I accept some building in Weeley has to take place the building going on top of Colcheters road and behind council offices is fair to say natural development to be expected, but building in Crow Lane on a dangerous country road with flood problems is probably the worst place the council could possibly allow to happen, it is quite road few houses that are in turn surrounded by nature and stunning views of natural landscape the impact to nature will be harmed as well as part of the natural beauty of ever dwindling landscapes that we should be protecting and looking at other areas where the impact of development is not so great on the existing landscapes we have so to me to build in Crow Lane is unacceptable and coming on to Crow lane there are no footpaths, lighting and a narrow road with lots of farm vehicles on, It is a crazy solution here in Weeley and again more traffic coming out of Crow Lane onto Colchester road with the already in development being built is far to much traffic for that road to cope with regardless of what these traffic road survey come from as by living here I no to get out onto Colchester road at various times of the day is very difficult because of the volume of traffic.

With regarding other possible developments in Weeley although I'm against them as I feel the number being built by the council offices should be sufficient if I had to be honest the mc donalds area would be the next best and only choice it would not impact so badly on where people are housed at the minute it doesn't really ruin any views people are enjoying having purchased their property for this reason its close to the train station as well with in walking distance close to shops and other various amenitys, it has
better safer roads to come in and out on and the lay out of the land could be designed in away to fit in with Weeley as a whole without looking to out of place, also this area I believe would have buildings for employment etc so weley would also get something back as a village by the devolplment going on but crow lane thre is no benefit to the community just a loss. So to me the only thing is if Weeley is to suffer this short fall in housing and bali this area out at least do it fairly not ruin a village in one foul swoop look at the plan with common sense to what could fit well and see what doesn't its quite obvious.
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

Address

Date...
Objection to the Proposed Local Plan (Weeley/TDC)

- I believe that Weeley has already provided its sufficient quota of new houses as even more buildings are already planned outside of the “proposed” plan.

- Local facilities are already overstretched especially schools, doctors surgeries and pharmacies. The local railway is just a local service with one local train per hour and NONE at all on a Sunday-no ticket facilities at all and just a basic car park. Main roads are blocked at most times especially near roundabouts...ALL other nearby villages need to access our through roads to travel through to the coast OR to Colchester & London directions, hence the pinch points are HERE already IF even more houses are built this would make all journeys even more perilous and even more difficult to get to or from work or school.

- There is little or no real employment locally and it will not be practical to introduce such places due to the really poor local transport & other infrastructure.

- Agricultural work is the only local employment as such, therefore using agricultural land to build on is both unwise and detrimental to local work, also we will be needing crops/locally grown produce for the future therefore loss agricultural land would mean losing our only really local assets.

- Local flooding is already a problem and even more hard surfaces/ built on ground would surely exacerbate that situation.

Signed.................................................................

Address......................................................post code..........................................

Date.................................................................
Planning Committee  
Tending District Council  
Weeley

30th August 2016

Dear Planning Committee

Re: Tending District Local Plan Preferred Options

I write to object to the above plan. Despite informed and educated evidence against the plan given at local planning consultation meetings, you plough on with the same inappropriate plan with no regard to residents of Weeley village.

Those of us who are residents do not bemoan the lack of facilities. We have chosen to reside here because of the rural location and surrounding countryside, and your plan will destroy this.

Your choice of Weeley? Well it has got a railway station, one that has limited parking and no Sunday service (or one planned). One that cannot cope with trains onward to London, passengers needing to change at Wivenhoe or Colchester. There are better served railway stations at Great Bentley and Alresford. Combined with a one hourly bus service (two hourly Sundays) public transport links are poor.

This means that anyone travelling is mostly going to do so by car (more pollution so not very green or environmentally friendly!). The roads are not fit for purpose for current traffic levels. The Weeley bypass has already seen a number of fatalities I think due to its poor design ie two lane with the overtaking death lane on some sections of the road. The 'Macdonalds roundabout is gridlocked at peak times every day, as is the roundabout joining the slip road to the A120 with long delays. Weekends/summer holidays are a nightmare with traffic heading to Frinton, Walton and Clacton. When I lived in Crow Lane our family didn’t venture out at weekends in the summer. Pity those trying to get out of the ongoing development ‘Barleyfields’.

Facilities and infrastructure are sorely lacking in every area. There are almost no facilities in Weeley – a pub, a bakers (at the moment), a post office and a crematorium. We do not have enough schools or doctors surgeries both already oversubscribed, and we cannot get doctors or teachers to come to this area. Nationally the Clacton area is not highly regarded and you need to face the fact that it has little appeal for quality professionals. Colchester General Hospital, already in special measures and is struggling to cope with demand, Colchester being one of the fastest growing towns in Europe.

So why the big build with such a small housing waiting list? Local farmers making land available that is cheap for developers? New build bonuses for the council and London councils buying up tracts of affordable housing because it is cheaper than developing brown field sites that they can sell off more profitably to local developers? Most of the Londoners I know have settled/retired in the local towns they’ve come to know as day-trippers, where they have shops and other facilities. They certainty won’t be rushing here because of employment opportunities.
Your plan is completely irresponsible and lacking in every possible way. You have a responsibility to local residents not to destroy the villages and countryside. You can only ruin an environment once.

I suggest you revoke this plan and have a complete re-think.

Yours sincerely

Carol Kincaid.
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 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 lagued with in this District.

Name: ................................................................. Signature: .................................................................

Address: .................................................................

[Handwritten Address]

[Handwritten 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>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.

Name: Chantal Thakrar  Signature: 
Address: Co16  

Weeley, Essex
C. Murray

Weeley

Re-Tendering District Council, Local Planning Policy for 1,500 Homes at Weeley / Weeley Heath.

I object to all the new homes proposed for our village. There is a big shortage of schools. We only have one infant, and one junior. With no vacancies and also no high school in the area.

The hospitals will not be able to cope with more people they are stretched to the full now. To book to see a GP you cannot see your preferred GP.

The upkeep of the roads and pavements is very poor and hardly any maintenance is carried out.

We have an hourly bus service usually packed AM. The train is hourly and you have to change for London. The road were not built to take amount of heavy traffic that comes along. It can take five or ten minutes to cross over the road. Or to even get my car out of my drive. More properties will cause more mayhem and gridlocks on our already congested, noisy, roads.

Weeley is a village NOT A TOWN. I moved here for village life NOT A TOWN where I moved from.

Yours sincerely
I object to the large-scale expansion of our village for the reasons listed below:

- Weeley is a small village, steeped in history, with approximately 490 properties north of the railway line and to introduce in excess of 1400 new homes plus 10 hectares of employment land in that area alone would be unfair and disproportionate, thus contrary to Par. 1 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and to Policy SPL1 of the proposed Tendring District Local Plan.

- Expanding the Settlement Development Boundary to such a massive extent would totally destroy the rural character and identity of the parish of Weeley and rob the country of much needed agricultural land. There is no way that it would be making a positive contribution to the quality of the local landscape as required by Local Policies SPL2, SPL3 and PPL3 and Par. 17 of the NPPF. Most certainly it would not be contributing to 'conserving and enhancing the natural environment' but instead would be causing overriding irreversible harm. Clearly, the proposed sites are environmentally unsustainable.

- Planned improvements to the A12, A120 and A133 will take many years to be delivered and would not even solve the existing traffic problems experienced in Weeley, where the local road systems including Clacton Road, the B1441, and the B1033 leading to Frinton and Walton via Thorpe-le-Soken are already heavily congested, particularly during the holiday season and rush hour times throughout the year. Bus and rail services are limited, Weeley is not on the fast line to London Liverpool Street and our local B roads and narrow winding lanes are not safe for cyclists. Consequently, such massive expansion would be unworkable in this area bringing misery to existing residents for many years to come and causing a detrimental effect on their health and wellbeing. This would be contrary to Policy CP1 (Sustainable Transport and Accessibility) and also to Policy HP1 of the proposed Plan that aims to help people have happier, healthier and longer lives with less inequality.

- The area has a high water table and is prone to surface water flooding, which is likely to be exacerbated by such large-scale over-development. The existing infrastructure whether it concerns sewage issues, surface water drainage, health services, school places, roads and pavements in dire need of repair, is failing to cope now and there is no guarantee whatsoever that the necessary improvements and updates would ever materialise. Selecting Weeley as an 'expanded settlement' would consequently be socially and economically unsustainable.

- It would also be contrary to the requirements of Section 7 of the NPPF as in no way would it be 'contributing to protecting and enhancing Weeley's natural, built and historic environment'. For instance, the land south of Thorpe Road has historical significance dating back to Napoleonic times and the parish itself has 13 listed buildings, 8 of which are north of the railway line. It is not simply the buildings themselves that are of historic significance but also their landscape setting as explained in Par. 28 of the NPPF and proposed Policy PPL9.

- The proposals are certainly not on a scale that meets a local need and do not have the support of the vast majority of residents of Weeley who have chosen to live in a small rural area and enjoy being part of a thriving village community. Thus the requirements set out in Par. 52 of the NPPF have not been met.
Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to lodge an objection to the red boundary line which cuts my garden in half.

I have sought a clear explanation of precisely why this has been drawn to include half within the plan and the rear half of my garden which backs onto the crematorium outside the plan.

I seek urgent explanation re

1. What does this mean with regard to my ability to develop the land? Shall I choose to do so.

2. Have the council any plans to utilise this piece of land, the half outside the local plan, in any way.

3. I note that my neighbour's gardens are the same and am sure they would like to know why this has happened.
4. Please provide a clear explanation as to what would happen to my position as owner of the land should the line:

(a) Remain
(b) Be moved to the rear boundary
(c) Be moved to exclude the whole property

Kind Regards

Mr. Clive Wakeford

email: [redacted]
phone: [redacted]
email: [redacted]
Dear Mr Meecham

RE: TENDRING DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN
PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION DOCUMENT, JULY 2016

I would like to submit the following comments and objections to some of the proposals in this consultation document.

Policy SP 3 (Providing for Employment), which gives figures for the amount of new employment land to be allocated in North Essex between 2016 and 2033, quotes a figure of 40 hectares for the entire Tendring District. However, far in excess of that amount is entered in the table set out in Policy PP7 (Employment Allocations), which has a total of 63.28 hectares, 10 hectares of which is allocated to the rural village of Weeley. At best, therefore, Weeley would be expected to provide just under 16% of the requirement for the whole of the Tendring District and at worst the figure would be as much as 25%, both unacceptable levels for the existing residents who put great value on the identity and character of their village and the nature of its rural surroundings.

Furthermore, Weeley is a small village, steeped in history, with less than 500 properties north of the railway line and to introduce in excess of 1400 new homes, including some mixed use areas, plus 10 hectares of employment land would be unfair and disproportionate, thus contrary to Par. 1 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and to Policy SPL 1 (Managing Growth) of the proposed Tendring District Local Plan.

Expanding the Settlement Development Boundary by such a massive extent would totally destroy the rural character and identity of the parish of Weeley and rob the country of much needed agricultural land. There is no way that it would be making a positive contribution to the quality of the local landscape as required by Draft Policies SPL 2, SPL 3 and PPL 3 and most certainly would not be contributing to ‘conserving and enhancing the natural environment’ but instead would be causing overriding irreversible harm and destroying the natural habitat of the abundant wildlife in the area. Clearly, the proposed sites are environmentally unsustainable.

Policy SP 5 (Place Shaping Principles) stipulates that all new development should respond positively to local character and context, to preserve and enhance the quality of existing communities. In no way would this be happening to Weeley, which is that part of the parish north of the railway line, were it to be quadrupled in size. There is no getting away from the fact that Tendring District Council is planning to destroy a village steeped in history and in so doing, would be annihilating a thriving, vibrant village community. That is NOT within the spirit of the NPPF.
Policy SP 5 also aims for North Essex to create well-connected places that prioritise the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport services above the use of the private car. Given that the busy and often congested B1033 passes through the village, from where there is also a network of other narrow, winding country lanes providing access to neighbouring villages, it is evident this would be difficult to achieve and potentially dangerous to attempt.

Planned improvements to the A12, A120 and A133 will take many years to deliver and would not even solve the existing traffic problems experienced in Weeley, where the local road systems including Clacton Road, the B1441, and the B1033 leading to Frinton and Walton via Thorpe-le-Soken are already heavily congested, particularly during the holiday season and at rush hour times throughout the year. Bus and rail services are limited, Weeley is not on the fast line to London Liverpool Street and our local B roads and narrow winding lanes are not safe for cyclists. Consequently, such massive expansion would be unworkable in this area bringing misery to existing residents, living on a building site for many years to come, (for the more elderly for the rest of their lives) thus causing a detrimental effect to their health and wellbeing. This would be contrary to Policy CP 1 (Sustainable Transport and Accessibility) and also to Policy HP 1 (Improving Health and Wellbeing) of the proposed Plan that aims to help people have happier, healthier and longer lives with less inequality. Furthermore, the serious issues relating to the high number of recent fatalities on the A133 between Weeley and Clacton need to be addressed before any large-scale development is even considered as a possibility for this area.

There appears to be a significant amount of contradiction within the document. For example, Policy SP 6 (Spatial Strategy for North Essex) tells us that development will be accommodated within or adjoining settlements according to their scale, sustainability and existing role and that future growth will be planned to ensure settlements maintain their distinctive character and role. There is no justification whatsoever, nor indeed justice for Weeley, the smallest in the original list of Rural Service Centres to suddenly be re-classified as an expanded settlement simply because it has a railway station on a slow line. There is no getting away from the fact that the bus and train services are limited with periods of longer than an hour for a significant number of the buses and trains running between Clacton and Colchester, few in the evenings and with no trains on Sundays but that is the price we pay for choosing and wanting to live in a peaceful, rural, farming area. In addition, most adults with any sense and self-discipline and who are physically able to do so, budget in order that they can afford to run a car and particularly in the countryside, in the twenty-first century, nobody has the right to tell them they should leave the vehicle at home and walk or try to travel by public transport instead. This is outrageous as are any plans to turn the village of Weeley into a town without the approval, co-operation and consent of its parish council and existing residents.

The table in Policy LP 1 (Housing Supply) indicates that for a district-wide housing requirement of 550 homes per year during the plan period Weeley’s contribution would be 304 residential properties, constituting an increase of 62% in the number of homes currently north of the railway line. That in itself is a disproportionate, unfair and unacceptable amount for an existing close-knit community to absorb. However, outrageously, we are told that if the District figure has to increase to 600 dwellings per year, the ENTIRE AMOUNT OF EXTRA HOUSING REQUIRED DURING THE PLAN PERIOD WILL BE DUMPED AT WEELEY, resulting in a total of 1,411 (elsewhere we are told 1,425, as 14 proposed at the top of St Andrew’s Road have been omitted), producing a scandalous increase in housing stock for our small village of 300%, in addition to anything between 16% and 25% of the entire district-wide new
employment site allocations being placed in Weeley!!! This would be totally unjustified and an unwelcome, disruptive intrusion on the lives of those of us who live in this delightful village and who recognise these proposals as being unworkable.

Also of considerable concern is that although details of the number of dwellings proposed for each of the residential and mixed use sites appear not to be shown within this document we, as residents, are aware that the developer who has already established a legal interest in the land to the south of Thorpe Road, Weeley, to accommodate a mixed use development including 304 properties (beyond the area where his company is already building 20 properties) is also the developer who sponsored the Red Arrows on both days of the Clacton Airshow, a show that Tendring District Council was determined would achieve even greater success than last year. Furthermore, he has also established a legal interest in land off Crow Lane (which leads up to the small village of Tendring) where, much to the despair of residents, he proposes to build a further 307 properties, if the higher density level of 600 properties per year throughout the district is required. Also, this building company, which appears to have mushroomed in size during recent years, has expressed the possibility of providing a small number of 'almshouses' on any sites within Weeley that they manage to have included in the emerging Local Plan. Interestingly, this is already in the process of being achieved in Lawford through a private limited company named Lawford Housing Enterprise Trust set up by the developer and a small group of Lawford District and Parish Councillors acting as individuals. Surely, these facts indicate the possibility that a certain degree of collusion might be taking place.

Currently, a considerable amount of land appears to be available throughout rural areas in the district as landowners are being encouraged to realise there is far more money to be had in selling their land for development purposes than continuing to use it for much needed farmland. In fact, there are far more suitable locations for large-scale developments than Weeley. For example, simply having 1,250 dwellings as Tendring’s contribution, during this plan period, to the proposed East Colchester/West Tendring new garden community certainly does not appear to correspond in scale to that which is planned for Weeley, considering that the former should be integrated into the ‘Knowledge Gateway’ an important area incorporating Essex University. Secondly, the potential of the A120 corridor as an area for future large-scale development appears to have been ignored without adequate explanation.

Plans for such massive over-development would also be contrary to the requirements of Section 7 of the NPPF as in no way would it be ‘contributing to protecting and enhancing Weeley’s natural, built and historic environment’. For instance, the land south of Thorpe Road has historical significance dating back to Napoleonic times and the parish itself has 13 listed buildings, 8 of which are north of the railway line. It is not simply the buildings themselves that are of historic significance but also their landscape setting as explained in Par. 28 of the NPPF and in the proposed Policy PPL 9. This is particularly so for the picturesque St Andrew’s Church, which truly is ‘the church in the fields’. Yet that will all change if 300+ properties within a mixed use development are built on nearby fields and as a result Objective 7 of the emerging Local Plan, which seeks to conserve and enhance Tendring District’s heritage, respecting historic buildings and their settings, links and views, would not be fully met.

The majority of residents in the parish of Weeley are content with their current village centres, namely The Street with the Black Boy Public House and restaurant opposite one end and the general store/post office and part-time bakery near the other. That area is a hive of activity on Saturday mornings when locals spend some considerable time chatting to each
other. The other centre is by St Andrew’s School, the village hall and recreation field, which is another meeting place for people from both this parish and the surrounding area. The majority of residents choose to live in Weeley because they enjoy its rural environment, a considerable number having left towns and cities for the countryside. They deserve the right to visit other more urban areas of their choice when they so wish and should not have a new neighbourhood centre as described in Policy PP3 (Village and Neighbourhood Centres) imposed upon them. A group of other people who do not live in our village should not have the right to change its nature and identity forever, against the wishes of the vast majority of its residents! We vigorously object to being ‘swallowed up’ by urbanisation in the form of massive housing estates, employment sites and a new ‘village centre’ – we will no longer be a village!

Weeley is also a tourist area with a number of successfully run ‘safeguarded’ holiday parks. People choose to purchase or rent holiday caravans/lodges/chalets in this parish because they value its rural surroundings, public footpaths, proximity to the coast and peaceful way of life. Its current contribution to Tendring District’s rural economy should not be ignored. Many people make the conscious decision to holiday in areas that have an equestrian, farming environment, as does Weeley. AN IMPORTANT POINT TO NOTE IS THAT NO MENTION IS MADE OF THE 20 HOLIDAY PITCHES THAT WERE GRANTED AT APPEAL FOR STARENA LODGE, CLACTON ROAD, WEELEY IN JANUARY 2014. THE WORK HAS NOW COMMENCED ON THE SITE, WHICH ALSO INCLUDES 4 CERTIFICATE OF LAWFUL USE RESIDENTIAL CARAVANS AND HAS BEEN RENAMED OAKLEIGH PARK. Reservations are already being made but, crucially, the area has not been marked as a holiday site or safeguarded holiday site on the Weeley/Weeley Heath Policy Map and there is no specific mention of it in the information accompanying Policy PP 11 (Holiday Parks). Is this an error?

The area of which Weeley is a part has a high water table with impermeable clay soil and is prone to surface water flooding. This situation is likely to be exacerbated by such large-scale over-development as is proposed for the village and consequently there is every possibility that Objective 9, regarding the risk of flooding, would also not be met. The existing infrastructure whether it concerns sewage issues, surface water drainage, health services, school places, roads and pavements in dire need of repair, is failing to cope now and there is no guarantee whatsoever that the necessary improvements and updates would ever materialise. Selecting Weeley as an ‘expanded settlement’ would consequently be socially and economically unsustainable.

There appears to be some inconsistency in the figures quoted in Section 5.9 (Traveller Sites), as the last sentence of Par. 5.36 states that to meet the residual requirement, 4 additional pitches would be required between 2014 and 2033. Yet Par. 5.38 refers to 5 additional pitches expected to be needed up to 2033 and Policy LP 9 (Traveller Sites) identifies 5 additional pitches.

A question that needs to be addressed in relation to the 10 pitches now allocated to Spring Stables, Gutteridge Hall Lane, Weeley, (8 of which already have planning permission) concerns the fact that the owner was recently advertising caravans for rent online at the Gumtree website. The published photographs showed the existing 3 Traveller pitches, but since the advertisements originally appeared these now contain considerably more caravans than are permitted and the advertised name of the site has been changed to Oakleigh Caravan Site, Gutteridge Hall Lane. Furthermore, the owner has told a friend of mine that he no longer intends letting out to Travellers. Surely, this would have serious implications
regarding the nature of the permission that was granted at appeal and the Traveller pitch allocations for the District.

Overall, the proposals are certainly not on a scale that meets just a local need and do not have the support of the vast majority of residents of Weeley, who have chosen to live in a small rural settlement and enjoy being part of a thriving village community. Thus the requirements set out in Par. 52 of the NPPF have not been met since the proposals to drastically change Weeley into an 'expanded settlement' do not have the support of its residents or of the residents from neighbouring villages. Consequently, I would request that the vast numbers proposed, particularly near the existing centres of our delightful village are withdrawn from this emerging plan. I would also request permission to attend and speak at the Examination in Public when this takes place in 2017.

Finally, it is worth mentioning at this point that, in due course, I will be submitting a response to some aspects of the Sustainability Appraisal, which is currently undergoing public consultation and have already noted that still further sites are being considered for Weeley.

Yours sincerely

Carol Bannister
Ms V. Tyler
Weeley, CO16 9JT

Re-Tendering District Council Council, Local Planning Policy for 1,500 homes etc. at Weeley/Weeley Heath.

I strongly oppose the above proposals. It is a DANGER TO OUR WAY AND OUR QUALITY OF LIFE. I moved to my property 13 years ago for a rural and quite way of life. During this time the amount of traffic that uses Colchester/Thorpe Road is atrocious and very noisy with the amount of containers and contractors alike, all times day and night. Our front windows are always closed because of the fumes. The infrastructure of the roads and pavements are long overdue and deterioration with the excess traffic.

The proposed housing is too much considering we only have one infant and junior school. Older students have to catch school buses to attend their school. With intending to build more homes this is only going to get much worse. Where are the thoughts for the pupils who have a future ahead of them? No doctors surgery or pharmacy.

We do not want homes going from Crow Lane across agricultural land. Public foot path, Rainbow Nurseries is used for those who enjoy walking themselves and their dogs across fields to Tendering.

Now Homes from The Bowling Green to the railway line spoils the whole outlook of our life. One train hourly to Colchester another where you have to change at Thorpe. Not sympathetic with those with mobility problems.

Leave WEELEY alone and let us all enjoy why we used our savings and invested our savings in an ideal Village dream alone. PLEASE.

We know that Tendering is controlled by government, but these are the residents requirements.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted]
I object to the large-scale expansion of our village for the reasons listed below:

- Weele is a small village, steeped in history, with approximately 490 properties north of the railway line and to introduce in excess of 1400 new homes plus 10 hectares of employment land in that area alone would be unfair and disproportionate, thus contrary to Par. 1 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and to Policy SPL1 of the proposed Tendring District Local Plan.
- Expanding the Settlement Development Boundary to such a massive extent would totally destroy the rural character and identity of the parish of Weele and rob the country of much needed agricultural land. There is no way that it would be making a positive contribution to the quality of the local landscape as required by Local Policies SPL2, SPL3 and PPL3 and Par. 17 of the NPPF. Most certainly it would not be contributing to ‘conserving and enhancing the natural environment’ but instead would be causing overriding irreversible harm. Clearly, the proposed sites are environmentally unsustainable.
- Planned improvements to the A12, A120 and A133 will take many years to be delivered and would not even solve the existing traffic problems experienced in Weele, where the local road systems including Clacton Road, the B1441, and the B1033 leading to Frinton and Walton via Thorpe-le-Soken are already heavily congested, particularly during the holiday season and rush hour times throughout the year. Bus and rail services are limited, Weele is not on the fast line to London Liverpool Street and our local B roads and narrow winding lanes are not safe for cyclists. Consequently, such massive expansion would be unworkable in this area bringing misery to existing residents for many years to come and causing a detrimental effect on their health and wellbeing. This would be contrary to Policy CP1 (Sustainable Transport and Accessibility) and also to Policy HP1 of the proposed Plan that aims to help people have happier, healthier and longer lives with less inequality.
- The area has a high water table and is prone to surface water flooding, which is likely to be exacerbated by such large-scale over-development. The existing infrastructure whether it concerns sewage issues, surface water drainage, health services, school places, roads and pavements in dire need of repair, is failing to cope now and there is no guarantee whatsoever that the necessary improvements and updates would ever materialise. Selecting Weele as an ‘expanded settlement’ would consequently be socially and economically unsustainable.
- It would also be contrary to the requirements of Section 7 of the NPPF as in no way would it be ‘contributing to protecting and enhancing Weele’s natural, built and historic environment’. For instance, the land south of Thorpe Road has historical significance dating back to Napoleonic times and the parish itself has 13 listed buildings, 8 of which are north of the railway line. It is not simply the buildings themselves that are of historic significance but also their landscape setting as explained in Par. 28 of the NPPF and proposed Policy PPL9.
- The proposals are certainly not on a scale that meets a local need and do not have the support of the vast majority of residents of Weele who have chosen to live in a small rural area and enjoy being part of a thriving village community. Thus the requirements set out in Par. 52 of the NPPF have not been met.

Signature

Address

Date 5/9/2016

Postcode

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: L. Wesley Smith
Address: WEELY HEATH

Signed: 
Date: 5/9/16
Dear Sirs,

District Local Plan
Preferred Options Consultation Document

I object in total to the proposed plan for Weeley and Weeley Heath. This plan is totally unacceptable. Consideration has not been given to providing adequate medical facilities due to the existing shortage of General Practitioners (long waiting appointment for a G.P. of ones choice) as well as schools being over subscribed.

The proposed extra 1500 dwellings would be detrimental to the existing village and certainly not in keeping with this valuable rural location. In very recent years at least 100 dwellings have been successfully granted in Weeley and its Heath area. One example being the garden area of Rosemary Cottage on Clacton Road opposite the junction with Mill Lane. This small garden has been ripped apart and three large dwellings are in the process of being built where apple trees and shrubs used to thrive as well as valuable flora and fauna.

Weeley is an historic rural area and any further development would destroy its unique character. I chose this bungalow for retirement because I've always been happy to live within easy reach of open space and village life and at my age of 82 years I do not want my remaining years being overwhelmed by this area being urbanised.

No mention has been made of upgrading the existing roads both classified and unclassified areas. Most of the more rural roads are in need of urgent need of repair. Many of these have uneven surfaces and potholes need to be repaired substantually.

With Brexit in mind the valuable agricultural land will be needed for the production of foodstuff for this increasing population.

Please consider my comments/objections and keep Weeley and its community as a VILLAGE and find a different and more suitable location if the extra 1500 dwellings are really necessary.

Yours faithfully

Mrs Mary C. Garner.
To whom it may concern

My husband and I are strongly against the amount of houses proposed for our village. We understand you have to build so many, but what you propose is quite ridiculous. It would cause mayhem on the roads through our village and beyond. We would lose our rural village, and that would be unacceptable to the community of Wixley, who have lived here for many years, simply because we love the countryside and all it has to offer. Could you explain to us where you will build another school as our school is full, where will you put our doctors, whom we cannot keep the doctors we have now and they are on full. and we do not want to be a town.

Yours sincerely
To then go on to develop huge areas of agricultural land—which cannot be replaced—would be folly. Our greenfield areas should be safeguarded, as it seems are the Avenues in Frinton, the Gardens in Clacton and the majority of Holland-on-Sea. Why are we not safeguarding our agricultural land?

I do hope that the Council takes note of all the points raised by the public and the community organisations and realise that some people do like to live in small rural communities surrounded by fields and hedgerows and not in large urbanised areas.

Yours faithfully

Hilary Hobson