Dear Sirs

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  MARK DIGGINS
Address

Signed

Date 6/9/16
Objection to the Proposed Local Plan

I hereby object to the following:-

I decided to live in Weeley Village because of the peace & quiet, also the feeling of well being that this RURAL community has provided up until now..

I DO NOT WISH TO LIVE ON A BUILDING SITE!

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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
5. There is already a suitable location available at Horsley Cross that should satisfy all of the aims of the Proposed Local Plan.

Signed.................................................................
Address........................................post code...CO15...........
Date..............
Objection to the Proposed Local Plan (Weeley/TDC)

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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: .................................................................post code: CO16...
Date: 17.9.2016

NA
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.................................................................
Address.................................................................
Date 08 SEP 2016...........................................................................
Objection to the Proposed Local Plan

I hereby object to the following:-

I decided to live in Weeley Village because of the peace & quiet, also the feeling of well being that this RURAL community has provided up until now.

I DO NOT WISH TO LIVE ON A BUILDING SITE!

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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!
5. 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...CO16

Date...25/7/11
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:-

I decided to live in Weeley Village because of the peace & quiet, also the feeling of well being that this RURAL community has provided up until now..

I DO NOT WISH TO LIVE ON A BUILDING SITE!

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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
5. 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...
Date...S/9/2016...
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 216 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 TR1s in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan: Pre-Submission Focused Changes states that developments will only be acceptable if the additional vehicular movements likely to result from the development can be accommodated within the capacity of the existing or improved highway network or would not lead to an unacceptable increase in congestion.
Policy CP1 in the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) – proposals for new development must be sustainable in terms of transport and accessibility and therefore should include and encourage opportunities for access to sustainable modes of transport, including walking, cycling and public transport.

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

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

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

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and the provision of key services like Education, Healthcare and the other necessary Infrastructure that is required like sewage. Then there is the impact on the Rural Economy, loss of Habitat and so many more issues which it would cause, with no guarantee that these key areas would be addressed appropriately. It seems irresponsible for Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies to consider large scale developments without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

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**

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

**Free-standing settlement**

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

**Local leadership and community support**

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

**Page 8**

**Local demand**

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

**Page 9**

**Infrastructure**

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

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

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

4. **Page 8 - Local demand**

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

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

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

5. **Page 9 - Infrastructure**

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

Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity

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

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

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

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

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

The Local Plan for Weeley is not sustainable and is in breach of many of the Local Plan Policies and the National Planning Policy Framework, the developments would be contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focused Changes and Policies CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on page 4118 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 Close; 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 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.
Objection to the Proposed Local Plan

I hereby object to the following:-

I decided to live in Weeley Village because of the peace & quiet, also the feeling of well being that this RURAL community has provided up until now..

**I DO NOT WISH TO LIVE ON A BUILDING SITE!**

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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!
5. 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...C416

Date...........
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.
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. (this does not include traffic joining from other proposed developments that will have to come through Thorpe and Weeley) 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) states the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.
Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan: Pre-Submission Focused Changes states that developments will only be acceptable if the additional vehicular movements likely to result from the development can be accommodated within the capacity of the existing or improved highway network or would not lead to an unacceptable increase in congestion.

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

Policy CP2 in the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) – Proposals which would have any adverse transport impacts will not be granted planning permission unless these are resolved and the development made acceptable by specific mitigation which are guaranteed to be implemented.
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4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring. Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

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

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

Name: 

Signature: 

Address: 

(partially redacted)
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...........................................
Date............................
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 to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Dear Sirs/madam,

My comments on the draft Local Plan for Tendring are:

It is ambiguous and aimed at the whims of developers. It is not aimed at the needs of local residents, it is aimed at the whims of Westminster and as a local District within a democratic society you should be representing us not them.

The Plan allows for people to be moved into the district into sub standard housing (you have decreased the minimum living space both internally and externally, more houses per hectare greater profits for the developer) utilising green gap and arable land before enforcing the use of brownfield, no doubt more profitable to the developer.

You have put a great majority toward Clacton and Weeley ignoring the lack of infrastructure and have ignored the A120 corridor even though all those who seem to make comment believe this to be the best option.

The people who are being moved here from the London Boroughs are being forced out of their home splitting up families and communities just to make the properties within London available at higher costs to the wealthy, being bought and rented to those by the wealthier.

There is no work this side of Colchester so why put the housing as far as you can, serviced by poor rail and road infrastructure (at a meeting I heard Neil Stock comment with another Councillor how good the service was on the Manningtree line, from the Clacton line, serving both London and Norwich bound services, the only downside being the parking, well that is an unsolvable problem!), away from those points.

The local services are deteriorating and will continue to do so as the new population will have no work or enthusiasm for the area in which they live.

The Plan asks for urbanisation, we the current residents do not.

There is no specific plan to protect Green Gap and Agricultural land and the borders around the Villages.

The Plan is not for us it is a Political tool to satisfy the Politicians and wealthy, very poor standards from officials elected to serve the residents of Tendring District, not London and Westminster.
I have lived for over 80 years in a quiet rural spot off Crow Lane where Tendring Weeley and Thorpe Parishes meet along Holland Brook. During this time many changes have taken place but I feel very strongly that the proposed development will have a detrimental effect on all three villages. Crow Lane is very narrow with no footpaths and several blind corners. With this proposed development it will become very dangerous. The access on to the Weeley Thorpe Road is already very busy with heavy traffic in both directions. This also has a detrimental effect on the approach to the Tendring Hundred Riding Club Show Ground. Riders seldom support our shows during the Holiday Season. The proposed Number of dwellings will greatly increase traffic & put unsustainable pressure on the Schools & Health & Social Services. It will also reduce the interesting Flora & Fauna in this rural area. I do hope you will think again about such a life changing development and find an alternative site with better road access.

Yours sincerely

Alison Isaac
From: Mrs P Quirke
Sent: 08 September 2016 13:01
To: Planning.policy
Subject: Objection to the Weeley plans
Attachments: Weeley OBJ.docx

Please find attached our objection to the proposed developments for Weeley and Weeley Heath.

Kind regards

P Quirke
Manningtree High School Academy Trust
Registered in England and Wales - Company No. 7883446
Registered Office - Lawford, Essex CO11

This email (including any attachments) is intended only for the recipient(s) named above. It may contain confidential or privileged information and should not be read, copied or otherwise used by any other person unless express permission is given. If you are not a named-recipient, please contact the sender and delete the email from your system. It is the recipient's responsibility to ensure that appropriate measures are in place to check for software viruses.
8th September 2016

Planning Policy Team
Tendring District Council
Council Office
Thorpe Road CO16 9AJ

Dear Sirs

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

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) with Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weeley once you build 2000+ homes. We already deal with an ever increasing level of traffic through the village, which at peak times is heavy. The nitrogen dioxide and the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, Lorries and tractors etc., will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents and will increase risk to health and welfare of residents and also for their safety. There are currently no pedestrian crossing facilities in Weeley or Weeley Heath.

The size of the proposal would be detrimental to our green spaces locally and with certain destruction of a wide range of habitat, trees, hedgerows and walkways. It will impact detrimentally on the village as a whole which will lose its historic identity. There are not enough services, shops, schools, and doctors etc. to cope with this capacity of new residents.

Although these sites will be near bus services and rail services the frequency of these services 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, we would think that it is essential to consider these points and so many more. We do not understand how TDC along with other governing bodies can consider another development with addressing the problems and poor infrastructure with which we are already plagued within this district.

Yours faithfully
Mr & Mrs P Quirke
Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to object to the housing development proposals for Thorpe-Le-Soken and Weeley.

The infrastructure of these two villages simply cannot take the volume of extra housing and are struggling to cope already. This would have a devastating effect on the Doctors surgery and the Schools not to mention the increased traffic problems.

What must also be considered is the effect this would have on the wildlife and its natural habitat. Once its gone! Please think very carefully about this. The villagers of Thorpe and Weeley want to live in the countryside not a concrete Jungle!

There are many other issues I could mention including lack of Police protection. Crime is up, especially in Thorpe-Le-Soken and an overpopulated village would only make matters worse.

I do not think we are being unreasonable as we expect natural development over the years but the Government has opened the flood gates on mass housing with little thought of the consequences.

I hope you will take my comments into consideration. Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

M A Crown
(Resident of Thorpe-Le-Soken for 47 years)
Dear Sirs,

I would formally like to suggest and promote the following sites suitable for development/redevelopment.

1. The Oaks, Weeley Heath - Development in the style of Kidby's Nursery.

2. Connaught Road, Weeley Heath.

3. Land abutting Bateman Road, Little Clacton – In particular the land abutting Bateman Road has been identified in the SHLAA. I believe it is now time to formally put forward the land as suitable for development.

Yours faithfully,

A Newton
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 falling 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.
Dear Sirs

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: D H Smith
Address: 

Signed

Date: 
Dear Sirs,

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  SUsAN WEBB  
Address  WEELEY  
1016.  

Signed  
Date  8th Sept. 2016.
Dear Sirs

Objection to the Proposed Local Plan

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

Name

Address

Signed: DAVID HELL

Date 8.9.16
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.  

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

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weeley 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. (this does not include traffic joining from other proposed developments that will have to come through Thorpe and Weeley) will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.
Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan: Pre-Submission Focused Changes states that developments will only be acceptable if the additional vehicular movements likely to result from the development can be accommodated within the capacity of the existing or improved highway network or would not lead to an unacceptable increase in congestion.

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

Policy CP2 in the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) – Proposals which would have any adverse transport impacts will not be granted planning permission unless these are resolved and the development made acceptable by specific mitigation which are guaranteed to be implemented.
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4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring. Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

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

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

Name: [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 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 beyond capacity, with no likelihood of funding for improvements to become available, as considerable changes would be required to make these roads safer for people to use. This is the current situation before adding a further 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles.

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

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and the provision of key services like Education, Healthcare and the other necessary Infrastructure that is required like sewage. Then there is the impact on the Rural Economy, loss of Habitat and so many more issues which it would cause, with no guarantee that these key areas would be addressed appropriately. It seems irresponsible for Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies to consider large scale developments without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weeley is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%. Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

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 so 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.
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21st August 2016

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

Planning Policy Team
Tendring District Council
Council Offices, Thorpe Road
Weeley, Essex, CO16 9AJ
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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. (this does not include traffic joining from other proposed developments that will have to come through Thorpe and Weeley) 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 Focussed Changes states that developments will only be acceptable if the additional vehicular movements likely to result from the development can be accommodated within the capacity of the existing or improved highway network or would not lead to an unacceptable increase in congestion.

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

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

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

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

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

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like flooding, sewage and the loss of agricultural land. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley
The 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. (this does not include traffic joining from other proposed developments that will have to come through Thorpe and Weeley) 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 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: Steven Hayhoe
Address: Weeley, Essex, CO16 9AJ

Signature: [Redacted]
I object to the proposals for Weele 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. (this does not include traffic joining from other proposed developments that will have to come through Thorpe and Weeley) 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 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 QI.2 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: Louise Mason Signature: [redacted]
Address: [redacted] Weeley, Essex CO16 [redacted]
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps - C30 Map 33 Weeley

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. (this does not include traffic joining from other proposed developments that will have to come through Thorpe and Weeley) 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 Weeley Railway Station is also within a reasonable walking distance, the frequency of the bus and rail service limited and they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable and so therefore contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focussed Changes and Policy CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like flooding, sewage and the loss of agricultural land. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
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.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 7 of Local Maps - C30 Map 33 Weeley

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

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

Page 7 – Eligibility criteria

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

SIZE

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

Free-standing settlement

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

Local leadership and community support

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

Page 8

Local demand

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

Page 9

Infrastructure

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

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

Name: Lorraine Larkin.
Address: [Redacted]

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

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 54 states that in rural areas local authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. The Map C30 33 Weele is of a village which there are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%. Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

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

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

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

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

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weele, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in 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.
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 effect 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: STEPHEN SCOTT

Address: WEELEY, CO16

Date: 21st August 2016
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C.30 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.

[Signature]

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
I object to the proposed local plan for Weeley for the following reasons;

I grew up in Weeley, I understand there is a local need for some development but I believe what is planned is completely disproportionate to local needs. Sustainable development should not have a detrimental impact on a village community as well as taking up in some cases highly productive arable land. We are a village and I always thought our local council had a responsibility, not only to the physical structures and fabric of the village but also to the community and the people held within it. It seems to date that our wishes are being completely disregarded. Just because the opportunity has arisen by local landowners providing parcels of land for development (some of whom I know personally and some of whom I am related to) that does not automatically mean developing this land is the right decision. This especially when taking into consideration the Brownfield sites available within the area, some of which have had planning permission turned down therefore being left to waste.

Our local schools are already at capacity. There are local families who have siblings split between different primary schools as they cannot get them in to the same schools as they are working at full capacity. Is this what I am to expect for my children growing up in the village? The same can be said for local doctors surgeries whom also all use the same hospitals, their resources are not infinite, we already see waiting times increasing.

The volume of traffic already passing through our village has greatly increased in recent years, on the B1033 for example I already have to wait several minutes sometimes to get out of my gateway, this obviously brings with it increased traffic noise. We do not have the infrastructure in place to cope with this vast increase in traffic. Getting in or out of the village at rush-hour at present can be testing enough.

We do not have the jobs to provide an income for the new occupants of these proposed dwellings, neither do we have the public transport to get them to places of work. Road links as I have already mentioned would be completely inadequate.

Being a rural settlement our green spaces and open countryside are an intrinsic part of our village, many people within our village who look out upon open fields and countryside will be faced with new housing estates. However pretty they are made to look, it will not be as attractive as the rural landscape we are used to and which we wish to protect. That is without mentioning the destruction of wild habitats supporting a great variety of wildlife under ever increasing pressures.
Some of the land outlined for proposed development to the south of Thorpe Road in particular is of historic interest to the village, dating back to Napoleonic times, having farmed that land as a child I know artefacts still turn up from the soil, when that is under concrete the "Barracks Field" will be nothing but a street name or an article in the parish book.

I urge you to explore all possible sites and proposed development locations before deciding the future of our village. I believe if this mass development on such a large scale does take place in Weeley it will have an irreversible strong negative impact on the community. Please consider the views of the local people who will have to live with your decisions, we are not naive, we understand that some development must come but not on this scale.

Yours sincerely
Mrs Sarah Hutchby
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 all of the aims of the Proposed Local Plan.

Signed: 

Address: 

Date: 8-9-2016
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.

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: [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 come peak times comes to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Name:** [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 come peak times comes to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

\[\text{Signature} \]

\[\text{Name} \]

\[\text{Address} \]
Objection to the Proposed Local Plan

I hereby object to the following:-

I decided to live in Weeley Village because of the peace & quiet, also the feeling of well being that this RURAL community has provided up until now..

I DO NOT WISH TO LIVE ON A BUILDING SITE!

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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
5. 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: 8/9/16
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: [Mrs. M. Middleton]

Address: [Redacted]...post code: CO16...

Date: 4/9/2016.
Dear Sirs

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 ROBIN WRIGHT
Address
Date 05.09.16
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.
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 Lewis Boniface
Address 
Date 5/09/16
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 278 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.

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: MRS G. BONIFACE
Address: WEELEY HEATH

CO16
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 318 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 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. (this does not include traffic joining from other proposed developments that will have to come through Thorpe and Weeley) 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 Weoley Railway Station is also within a reasonable walking distance, the frequency of the bus and rail service limited and they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable and so therefore contrary to Policy QL2. TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focussed Changes and Policy CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like flooding, sewage and the loss of agricultural land. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 13 of C Local Plans – 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. (this does not include traffic joining from other proposed developments that will have to come through Thorpe and Weeley) 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 Weeley Railway Station is also within a reasonable walking distance, the frequency of the bus and rail service is limited and they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable and so therefore contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focussed Changes and Policy CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

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

Name: Donna Fuller

Address: Weeley, Colne

Signature: [Redacted]
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: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Post code: [Redacted]
Date: 5 Sept 16
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

The Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) – Section 4.3.5 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 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. (this does not include traffic joining from other proposed developments that will have to come through Thorpe and Weeley) will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.
Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan: Pre- Submission Focused Changes states that developments will only be acceptable if the additional vehicular movements likely to result from the development can be accommodated within the capacity of the existing or improved highway network or would not lead to an unacceptable increase in congestion.

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

Policy CP2 in the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) – proposals which would have any adverse transport impacts will not be granted planning permission unless these are resolved and the development made acceptable by specific mitigation which are guaranteed to be implemented.
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4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring. Any future improvements to the A120 and the A133 are dependent on Essex County Council (the Highway Authority) to identify the nature and cost of improvements needed, seek sources of public funding and consider the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to secure contributions towards these works. It is very un-likely that in the current economic climate that any funding for such a significant project as improving the A120 and the A133 would ever come to fruition, especially as Essex County Council Highways cannot maintain the current road infrastructure to what could be considered an adequate level.

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

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

[Signature]

Name: 
Address: 

Clacton, CO13 6JE
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: ____________________
Address: ____________________
Date: ____________________
Objection to the Proposed Local Plan

I hereby object to the following:-

I decided to live in Weeley Village because of the peace & quiet, also the feeling of well being that this RURAL community has provided up until now..

I DO NOT WISH TO LIVE ON A BUILDING SITE!

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

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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!

5. 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...

Date...
Dear Sirs

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. For 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 the 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: Tina Spong
Address: [Redacted]

Signed: [Redacted]
Date: [Redacted]
Dear Sirs

Objection to the Proposed Local Plan

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

Name

Address

Signed

Date 6.9.16

MR P BURNES
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley by Planning Services.

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

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

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

Point 2.16 Traffic congestion constrains the economy and impacts negatively on quality of life by:
- constraining existing economic activity as well as economic growth, by increasing costs to businesses, damaging competitiveness and making it harder for them to access export markets. Businesses regularly consider access to good roads other transport connections as key in making decisions about where to locate.
- leading to a marked deterioration in the experience of road users. For some, particularly those with time-pressured journeys, congestion can cause frustration and stress, as well as inconvenience, reducing the quality of life.
- constraining job opportunities as workers have more difficulty accessing labour markets.
- traffic congestion constrains the economy and impacts negatively on quality of life, causing more environmental problems, with emissions per vehicle and greater problems of blight and intrusion for people nearby. This is especially true where traffic is routed through small communities or sensitive environmental areas.

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

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

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

Name: JAMES BROWN
Address: [Redacted]
Signature: [Redacted]
Date: Weeley 2016
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

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

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

Page 7 – Eligibility criteria

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

SIZE

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

Free-standing settlement

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

Local leadership and community support

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

Page 8

Local demand

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

Page 9

Infrastructure

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

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

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

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

4. **Page 8 - Local demand**

Whilst there may be a requirement for new homes as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and also in Policy SP1 in Strategic Part 1 – Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016), which promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development that performs an economic, social and environmental role. It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weeley are clearly not required by the residents of Weeley and that contrary to fulfilling any economic, social or environmental needs, would in fact have the opposite effect and would result in the loss of a viable community, whilst destroying a historic and beautiful village which dates back to the Doomsday Book.

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

5. **Page 9 - Infrastructure**

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

By Planning Services

Objection to the Proposed Local Plan

- Building in Weeley Heath and Weeley Village has already reached its 10% quota for the next few years. The proposed developments are totally disproportionate and detrimental, and not in keeping with the rural nature of the region.
- The plan is OVER-DEVELOPMENT on a massive and totally unacceptable level, by anyone's standards. Increasing the size of a village from 750 dwellings to over 2500 cannot be right or proper.
- The land proposed is good agricultural land. Development is therefore CONTRARY to sustainability in my view!
- Health and well-being of the existing population under threat. There is no NHS provision to cover the extra population - build surgeries, but where will the staff come from? Likewise with schools and teaching staff.
- Motor Transport links are ghostly, 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: E. MEAD
Address: [Redacted]
Date: 08/09/16

Signed: [Redacted]
Dear Sirs

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: TREvor RUMBLE
Address: [Redacted]

Signed: [Redacted]
Date: 6.9.16
Objection to the Proposed Local Plan

I hereby object to the following:-

I decided to live in Weeley Village because of the peace & quiet, also the feeling of well being that this RURAL community has provided up until now..

I DO NOT WISH TO LIVE ON A BUILDING SITE!

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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!
5. 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.

Date.
Dear Sirs

By Planning Services

Objection to the Proposed Local Plan

- Building in Weeley Heath and Weeley Village has already reached its 10% quota for the next few years. The proposed developments are totally disproportionate and detrimental, and not in keeping with the rural nature of the region.
- The plan is OVER-DEVELOPMENT on a massive and totally unacceptable level, by anyone's standards. Increasing the size of a village from 750 dwellings to over 2500 cannot be right or proper.
- The land proposed is good agricultural land. Development is therefore CONTRARY to sustainability in my view!
- Health and well-being of the existing population under threat. There is no NHS provision to cover the extra population - build surgeries, but where will the staff come from? Likewise with schools and teaching staff.
- Motor Transport links are ghastly, the roads ill-maintained, and the slightest hiccup causes major tailbacks right from the A120 down to Weeley roundabout. Extra thousands of cars are not going to help that situation at all! Hold-ups to traffic exiting Clacton at weekends is up to a mile long to Weeley roundabout.
- Rail Transport is a joke. One local station, un-manned, with no ticket machine - services stopping at every local station to Colchester, and only running once an hour, not on Sundays. Far better would be the access to Manningtree main-line station from a development at Horsley Cross. Interestingly, the Chair of the Councils 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.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 216 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.

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.
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I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 3.3 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.

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: Pete Buckland

Address: [redacted]

[redacted]
Dear Sirs

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 back-ups right from the A120 down to Weeley roundabout. Extra thousands of cars are not going to help that situation at all! Hold-ups to traffic exiting Clacton at weekends is up to a mile long to Weeley roundabout.

- Rail Transport is a joke. One local station, un-manned, with no ticket machine - services stopping at every local station to Colchester, and only running once an hour, not on Sundays. Far better would be the access to Manningtree main line station from a development at Horsley Cross. Interestingly, the Chair of the Council's Local Plan Committee admitted that he goes to Manningtree rather than catch a train locally!!

- Infrastructure in Tendring as a whole is at breaking point, as illustrated by the recent sink-hole appearing in Thorpe-le-Soken high street. Sewage backs up all along the pipes from Thorpe to Weeley, and overflows near the crematorium roundabout, and down under Weeley bridge. How on earth does anyone in their right mind expect it to cope with another 2000 dwellings?

- The council have completely ignored the historic and rural nature of Weeley, which is mentioned in the Domesday book and is one of the oldest villages in the area. Our historic sites need protection from encroachment by unnecessary and unwanted developments. The Church is well-known as being one of few standing in fields, and is much admired as such.

- It is the Tendring District Council's stated aim to increase and encourage tourism. If they mean by that - building right up to the boundaries of the two caravan/chalet holiday camps in the area - then I fail to see what they hope to achieve. Holiday makers come here because of the rural nature of the area, and they most certainly would not choose their holiday right next to a housing estate.

Name  

Address

Date 6/9/16  

Signed

$3

2016  

Weeley Heath
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.

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: [Redacted]  Signature: [Redacted]
Address: Weeley Heath CO16- [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 come peak times comes to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road. B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. will in no doubt change the situation here for current residents, and will increase the risk to not just the health and welfare of the residents but also their safety and increase the risk for future generations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name SALLY DIXON
Address

Weeley Heath Essex CO16 9AJ
Dear Sirs

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: K.L. WOODLEY
Address: Weeley, Harwich

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 6/09/2016
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.

Signed .................................................................
Address ................................................................. Postcode .................................................................
Date .................................................................
Dear Sirs

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 Ryan Potter
Address Weeley Heath
Signed
Date 6/9/16