By Planning Services

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In relation to the local plan I believe that sites such as ours at 2 Barnfield, 1 Barnfield, and The Tides represent a better option for aspirational housing to encourage working and professional people to relocate to this area, thereby adding stimulus to the local economy. Barnfield is equidistant to two primary schools and major stations, and sits on the best route between two major roads between Chaddesden and Ellesmere. We are also one of the most architecturally available sites in the area.

We would very much welcome the opportunity to discuss our site as an option for development.

I look forward to speaking with you.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Received On

0-9-SEP-2016

By Planning Services
FOR THE ATTENTION OF PLANNING OFFICERS AT TENDRING DISTRICT COUNCIL

Applications 16/00762/FUL and 16/00764/OUT

16/00762/FUL is purely an application to enable vehicular access onto a proposed housing estate of 120 properties in our rural village and to change a section of the agricultural land into an area of open space. If it were to be approved nearby residents would suffer a period of unacceptable nuisance, noise and pollution whilst the demolition is carried out and for what purpose if the application for 120 homes on much-needed agricultural land is refused? It will not be required if the outline application is not granted, so the two applications should be considered together and I ask Tendring District Council to REFUSE these schemes for the reasons expressed in this letter.

The proposals would destroy the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside and have a detrimental urbanizing impact, to an unacceptable level, on the lives of residents living nearby.

Such a large development would not be appropriate to the locality and would have a damaging effect on the privacy, daylight and amenity of neighbouring properties.

It contravenes national policies on development in the countryside, which aim to ensure that small rural areas are not swamped by inappropriate growth. It would be unfair and disproportionate to increase the number of properties by such a large extent in a village that is mainly set out in a ribbon development. The land should be retained for agricultural use, thus also protecting wildlife, including roosting bats, owls and Great Crested Newts that are known to inhabit the surrounding area. Much-needed farmland cannot be replaced.

Furthermore, the area is prone to flooding during times of heavy and persistent rainfall and our fear is that such large-scale development would be likely to increase the risk of further flooding elsewhere, particularly for nearby properties lower down on the hillside.

Despite local opposition, 80 homes have already been granted planning permission in various parts of Weeley Heath and to introduce a further 120 would be increasing its size by over 75%. In no way would this simply be addressing a local need in a village that council officers have previously recognised as having an historic environment, which merits protection. The land is outside the village envelope in both the 2007 Local Plan and the emerging plan and is both environmentally and socially unsustainable for housing development. The applications are also in addition to the unacceptable mass development of over 1400 properties proposed for the village of Weele, north of the railway line.

The local infrastructure just would not cope and the quality of life for existing residents would be eroded forever. Bus and rail services are limited and unlikely to become more frequent in the near future, as one would expect in a rural area, and St Andrew's Primary School is oversubscribed. Health services are already stretched to the limit in the Tendring District with difficulties in recruiting staff. Colchester Hospital is in constant crisis and neither Weeley nor Weeley Heath has a medical surgery or pharmacy or likely to have one in the near future. The local road network is entirely unsuitable for such large-scale development, particularly during the summer months when thousands of tourists, who make a much-needed contribution to Tendring’s economy, visit the coastal resorts.

I object strongly to an estate of 120 properties being built in the rural village of 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.

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”.

1
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. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

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

Address

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Address

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

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

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

.........................................................
From: Adrian Leggett
Sent: 07 September 2016 23:31
To: Planning.policy
Cc: Cllr. Neil Stock, Leader of the Council; Cllr. Jeffrey Bray; Cllr. Mike Brown; wealeyresidents@yahoo.com
Subject: Strategic Part 1 Local Plans: Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment consultation - Weeley Garden Village

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write as a resident of Weeley for the last 12 years to object in the strongest possible terms to Tendring District Council’s Local Plan and the impact of your proposed Weeley Garden Village (WGV) on the existing settlement of Weeley.

I am not opposed to the building of new homes to meet growing need, I am not opposed to change or progress, what I am opposed to is the totally disproportionate size of the proposed WGV when set against the size of the existing village.

The population of Weeley in the 2011 census is given as 1098. Assuming an average of only 2 additional residents in each of your proposed new 1411 dwellings, the population of Weeley could rise to at least 4000 by 2021-2026.

All of the proposed developments in the Plan represent small expansions on the fringes of existing towns and villages such as Clacton, Harwich, Frinton, Manningtree etc. The only exception to this is Weeley, for which your WGV proposals will completely change the nature and feel of the village from a small friendly rural settlement to a mini town with an influx of some 3000 additional residents.

The proposed expansion area around Weeley is entirely comprised of green field sites the development of which would be to the detriment of the local environment and the well-being of residents, and in direct conflict to the Council’s environmental policies, aims and objectives. I would further question whether this development could have a positive Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) or Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) when all of the relevant factors are taken into account.

My specific objections to the sections of the plan are;

Section References
2.8.1.3 - I reject your recommendation that the Weeley Expanded Settlement should be recommended for major development because you have under estimated the environmental and well-being impact of the proposals
2.48/9 - Weeley will not benefit from additional facilities because Weeley does not want this development.
5.37/8 – I reject your assertion that Weeley needs 2 further traveller pitches. We do not want the problems of crime and vandalism associated with the traveller community to be increased further by creating additional capacity.
5.7 – The 1411 new houses will totally change the character of the small historic village of Weeley forever, and reduce the benefit the current residents derive from living in the village. Your proposed new facilities/infrastructure will not mitigate this.
6.64 – An impartial assessment of the Weeley development should not score well when you take into account the lasting, irreparable changes these proposals will have on the existing community
B12 – I am appalled that support for your proposals from land overs/developers, who dearly stand to earn a financial benefit from the development, should be included in your report as a positive reason to approve the development.
B15 – Here you state that out of all of your development criteria the only merit of the WGV proposal is the transport links, this is a wholly inadequate reason to ignore the environmental concerns and views of residents and proceed with these plans.
C30 - I am dismayed and mystified about the extent of the permitted development land for Weeley compared to other towns/villages. How has this been allowed to develop out of proportion to other areas?

On page 26 you assert that new garden communities are at the heart of your strategic vision for North Essex. I can assure you that this vision is not shared by the residents of Weeley. You envisage that this will create community cohesion. It will not. It will create a divisive town of 4000 people, depending on whether the house you live in is in the existing village or new development.

In compiling this plan you may have followed all of the national planning guidance but you have failed to take account of resident’s views and aspirations. You did not need this consultation to tell you that. These plans could only look like a good idea from the perspective of a planning officer with a target to meet, and not a Tendring resident.

The Council does not own Weeley and has no right to oppose the wishes of the current residents who vehemently object to your expansion plans. Yes the Council has a duty to provide additional homes, but it also has a duty to listen to the wishes of the community who elect it and who it serves. These proposals are so unbalanced that these responsibilities are significantly out of alignment; they put the profits of landowners and developers above the well-being and quality of life of villagers.

I have copied this email to Cllr Stock as Leader of the Council and Chair of the Local Plan Committee, and to Cllrs Bray and Brown as Ward Members for Little Clacton and Weeley; I am not aware of their views on these proposals but if they listen to their local communities and electorate they will understand the strength of feeling about these plans and hopefully they will oppose them in Council.

I have also copied in the Weeley Residents Association who in their short history have done an excellent job in raising awareness of these proposals and opposing them.

If this is a meaningful consultation and local democracy has any value then these proposals for Weeley will not be allowed to proceed for the reasons set out above.

Yours sincerely,

Adrian Leggett

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

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

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weeley once you build 2000+ houses. We already have to deal with an ever increasing level of traffic through the village, which every morning and evening come peak times comes to a slow crawl on the B1441 Clacton Road, B1033 Colchester/Thorpe Road and merging into the traffic as it makes its way along the A133 down to the A120. The nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and in particular the emissions that will be generated from a further 3000+ cars, lorries, tractors etc. (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 ................................................. Signature .................................................

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

The proposed developments would be contrary to Paragraph 32 of the NPPF. Policy TR1a, SD8, CP1, CP2 as the developments would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road, these roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. In my opinion it is irresponsible to propose such large scale developments in an area, where the roads are already stretched to beyond capacity, with no likelihood of funding for improvements to become available, as considerable changes would be required to make these roads safer for people to use. This is the current situation before adding a further 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles 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 any more 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.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

The proposed developments would be contrary to Paragraph 32 of the NPPF, Policy TR1a, SD8, CP1, CP2 as the developments would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road, these roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. In my opinion it is irresponsible to propose such large scale developments in an area, where the roads are already stretched to beyond capacity, with no likelihood of funding for improvements to become available, as considerable changes would be required to make these roads safer for people to use. This is the current situation before adding a further 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles 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.
I object to the proposals for Weele as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weele.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

The proposed developments would be contrary to Paragraph 32 of the NPPF. Policy TR1a, SD8, CP1, CP2 as the developments would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road, these roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. In my opinion it is irresponsible to propose such large scale developments in an area, where the roads are already stretched to beyond capacity, with no likelihood of funding for improvements to become available, as considerable changes would be required to make these roads safer for people to use. This is the current situation before adding a further 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles and this does not include the additional traffic which will be caused through the developments proposed in Thorpe, Kirby, Clacton to name just a few.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: [REDACTED]  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Signature: [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 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.
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 the 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 or 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 ...
Address ...
Holland-on-Sea
...
CO15 ...
...
Signature S. Mullock
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 [Redacted]
Address [Redacted]

Signed [Redacted]
Date 3/9/16
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 22 in Map 30, Map 33 of 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 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).

Name ........................................... Signature ...........................................
Address ..............................................

CO16
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Map 630 Map 33 Weeley

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

Policy CP2 in the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) – Proposals which would have any adverse transport impacts will not be granted planning permission unless these are resolved and the development made acceptable by specific mitigation which are guaranteed to be implemented.
The proposed developments would be contrary to Paragraph 32 of the NPPF, Policy TR1a, SD8, CP1, CP2 as the developments would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road, these roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. In my opinion it is irresponsible to propose such large scale developments in an area, where the roads are already stretched to beyond capacity, with no likelihood of funding for improvements to become available, as considerable changes would be required to make these roads safer for people to use. This is the current situation before adding a further 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles and this is without the additional traffic which will be created by developments proposed for other areas that will also need to join these already overwhelmed roads.

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

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

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

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

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

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

How can it be considered sensible to build in an area where at present the roads cannot cope with the capacity of cars and so to build another 1,500 to 2,000 houses, which would result in an increase of traffic in the region of 3,000 to 4,000 cars is definitely unsustainable. Further-more the National Policy Statement for National Networks – December 2014 states the following:
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Point 2.16 **Traffic congestion constrains the economy and impacts negatively on quality of life by:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring.

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

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within reasonable walking distance. The frequency of the bus and rail service is limited with mostly one train per hour, no service on a Sunday and no direct route to London or Norwich.
So in my opinion they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable. The developments would fail against the social role set out in Paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and its Core Principle of making the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and would be contrary to Policy QL2 in the adopted Local Plan. The proposal should therefore not constitute sustainable development.

Infrastructure includes services, like education; the criteria required is flawed as one of the reasons Weeley was identified as a Key Rural Area for development is because of the misapprehension that Weeley has a Primary School, which in fact is not the case as indicated in the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) - Page 218 C30 Map 33 Weeley. Weeley village also does not have any facilities in the way of medical healthcare with there being neither doctors’ or dentists’ surgeries and so any developments would have to not just say that there would be a possibility of these services being provided but would need to deliver in order to comply with the Policy SP4.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more, like sewage, flooding, the loss of natural habitat, the loss of fertile agricultural land and the potential increased threat to residents and car drivers. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 of C Local Maps – C30 Map 35 Weeley

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Policy TR1a** in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

**Policy CP2** in the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) – Proposals which would have any adverse transport impacts will not be granted planning permission unless these are resolved and the development made acceptable by specific mitigation which are guaranteed to be implemented.
The proposed developments would be contrary to Paragraph 32 of the NPPF, Policy TR1a, SD8, CP1, CP2 as the developments would be routed onto the B1441 Weele By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road. These roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. In my opinion it is irresponsible to propose such large scale developments in an area, where the roads are already stretched to beyond capacity, with no likelihood of funding for improvements to become available, as considerable changes would be required to make these roads safer for people to use. This is the current situation before adding a further 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles and this is without the additional traffic which will be created by developments proposed for other areas that will also need to join these already overwhelmed roads.

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

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

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

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

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

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

How can it be considered sensible to build in an area where at present the roads cannot cope with the capacity of cars and so to build another 1,500 to 2,000 houses, which would result in an increase of traffic in the region of 3,000 to 4,000 cars is definitely unsustainable. Further-more the National Policy Statement for National Networks – December 2014 states the following:
Point 2.16 Traffic congestion constrains the economy and impacts negatively on quality of life by:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring.

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

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within reasonable walking distance. The frequency of the bus and rail service is limited with mostly one train per hour, no service on a Sunday and no direct route to London or Norwich.
So in my opinion they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable. The developments would fail against the social role set out in Paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and its Core Principle of making the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and would be contrary to Policy QL2 in the adopted Local Plan. The proposal should therefore not constitute sustainable development.

Infrastructure includes services, like education; the criteria required is flawed as one of the reasons Weeley was identified as a Key Rural Area for development is because of the misapprehension that Weeley has a Primary School, which in fact is not the case as indicated in the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) - Page 218 C30 Map 33 Weeley. Weeley village also does not have any facilities in the way of medical healthcare with there being neither doctors’ or dentists’ surgeries and so any developments would have to not just say that there would be a possibility of these services being provided but would need to deliver in order to comply with the Policy SP4.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more, like sewage, flooding, the loss of natural habitat, the loss of fertile agricultural land and the potential increased threat to residents and car drivers. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.
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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 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 Enquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified when in comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Weeley, CO16 9

[Redacted]
Dear Sir

Ref: Tendring District Local Plan

I strongly object to the Tendring District Local Plan and in particular the proposed and excessive estate building around the small village community of Weele and around any other small communities.

I am a resident of Weele Heath where we have been powerless in preventing the steady erosion of our Green Belt land. Agricultural land is being turned over to building sites, equestrian centres or simply left to stagnate in order to qualify for development. There is a national recognition developing that we need to preserve, encourage and extend our available land for the production of food. This recognition has yet to supersede (which it will) the desire of the developers to smother such land in dwellings.

There has long been recognition that such areas should be preserved or enhanced for their natural diversity of flora and fauna, their underground water courses, the natural decay that conditions the soil structure and provides a richness of nutrients and the oxygenation of the air we breathe. Further, such areas contribute to our wellbeing and quality of life.

I have viewed the proposed plans for development within the Tendring area. Undoubtedly Weele is set to suffer to such a degree that it will lose its village status, its identity, its community, its security, its voice and its pride. This must not be allowed to happen and Weele and Weele Heath residents should be allowed the final say in the future of their respective villages, rather than the decision making process being left to the few who care not a jot for the wellbeing of others.

In such situations the general outcome is misery for residents old and new. While there may be an eventual admission that a mistake was made, by then it will be too late and any attempt at regeneration will be unnatural and of little effect.
Such developments should never have been considered in the first place. Please do not let this happen to Weeley or any other community within the Tendring District Council environs. Tendring District Council have a duty of care towards their communities, to protect them from being ravaged by marauding developers.

It could be argued that Tendring District Council are just following government directives. It could also be argued that government have already failed to recognise the strength of public feeling this year given the unexpected outcome of a referendum vote. Many voted Brexit in order to curb an ever increasing population in their villages, cities and towns. Given the result of the referendum a degree of respect has been shown for the nation’s fears for the future, let that respect also be shown by districts towards villages.

The public want their voices heard, the control of their destinies returned and their pride back. Politicians and councils need to work with the public, with communities, to listen to them and to support their needs.

Weeley and Weeley Heath ask Tendring District Council for their support in this respect.

A blind eye had been turned to the challenges of everyday life in a globalised world. We are the residents it is demanded must accept mass estate housing where once there had been a small village. Lives and communities should not be allowed to bear the brunt and full impact of such controversial plans and this is no mean thing.

I refer the reader to The Joseph Rowntree ‘Estate Regeneration Briefing’ which illustrates my point well.

What will Weeley have to offer a new resident?

A new town with no identity. A mass influx of new residents will erase any previous identity and create an identity of its own. Total lockdown of the infrastructure.

Lack of green spaces, a congested environment, loss of wild life and land management. Reduced air quality, noise pollution, overuse of natural resources.

Unemployment, in work poverty, job insecurity, loss of jobs in the low skills sector, reliance on benefits, a rising crime rate, insufficient policing, congested roads, a struggling hospital, referrals to distant hospitals, struggling retailers, dying shopping centres and a reliance on discounted foodstuffs and charities.

Insecurity, anxiety, depression, failing health. Crime, offences, injury and property damage, lack of freedom through fear. Antisocial behaviour.

No funding available to lessen the effect of the above.
This is not an exhaustive list and such issues are researched and recognised. I urge Tendring District Council to rethink their approach to any governmental plans for mass housing. We should not be abandoned and made to suffer for the folly and profit of others.

Yours sincerely

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

The proposed developments would be contrary to Paragraph 32 of the NPPF, Policy TR1a, SD8, CP1, CP2 as the developments would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road; these roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. In my opinion it is irresponsible to propose such large scale developments in an area, where the roads are already stretched to beyond capacity, with no likelihood of funding for improvements to become available, as considerable changes would be required to make these roads safer for people to use. This is the current situation before adding a further 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles 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.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C30 Map 33 Weeley.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

The proposed developments would be contrary to Paragraph 32 of the NPPF, Policy TR1a, SD8, CP1, CP2 as the developments would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road, these roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. In my opinion it is irresponsible to propose such large scale developments in an area, where the roads are already stretched to beyond capacity, with no likelihood of funding for improvements to become available, as considerable changes would be required to make these roads safer for people to use. This is the current situation before adding a further 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles and this does not include the additional traffic which will be caused through the developments proposed in Thorpe, Kirby, Clacton to name just a few.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: [Redacted]  
Signature: [Redacted]

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

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

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weeley once you build 2000+ houses. We already have to deal with an ever increasing level of traffic through the village, which every morning and evening 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: [Blacked out]
Address: [Blacked out]
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C50 Map of 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: D. HENNESSY
Address: [redacted]
Signature: [redacted]
By Planning Services

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

The 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) Parishioner 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 would fail as they do not represent a sustainable development in the context of paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, because the adverse environmental impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the development.

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

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

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) **requires that** development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

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

Name: **JANET MCDONALD**  
Address: **CLACTON ON SEA, ESSEX**  
Signature: **[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

Received On

Address

21st August 2016

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

By Planning Services
Policy Planning Manager.../Chairman of the Planning Committee
Tendring District Council, Council Offices,
Thorpe Road, Weeley
Clacton-on-Sea
Essex CO16 9AJ

Objection to the Proposed Local Plan

I hereby object to the following:-

1. The overall number of proposed dwellings are far too excessive for a village the size of Weeley...this would result in severe overdevelopment of what is an historic
village of currently under 1000 dwellings total to date and with a potential of 2000
+ upwards EXTRA if this plan IS accepted.
2. Weeley has already MORE than its fair quota of newbuild homes planned, or under
construction already therefore the proposed number would ruin the village and be
detrimental to our health and well being as is already the case for many residents.
3. The present local sewerage system is already a serious issue with leakage and
flooding in peoples gardens and other areas already, further pressure on this system
is not viable.
4. The local road and transport facilities and levels are already horrendous and a few
thousand extra vehicles using these if so many homes were built would ensure even
further delays and road blockages than we suffer already especially during peak &
holiday times. Many local lanes are already seeing extra vehicles trying to avoid the
main road backlogs.
5. Local transport is a nightmare already and holiday traffic is already finding it difficult
to use these local roads. The holiday trade is most important to the area and should
not have to suffer to the detriment of the area as it certainly soon will!
6. There is already a suitable location available at Horsley Cross that should satisfy the
all of the aims of the Proposed Local Plan.

Signed.................................................................
Address.........................................................post code...CO16
Date...26/2/16
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. 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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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 Weeleuy Railway Station is also within a reasonable walking distance, the frequency of the bus and rail service is limited and they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable and so therefore contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focussed Changes and Policy CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

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

Name: Martin Street
Signature: [Signature]
Address: 46 Colnegate Road, Weeleuy, Essex CO16 9JS
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

Policy CP2 in the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) – Proposals which would have any adverse transport impacts will not be granted planning permission unless these are resolved and the development made acceptable by specific mitigation which are guaranteed to be implemented.
The proposed developments would be contrary to Paragraph 32 of the NPPF, Policy TR1a, SD8, CP1, CP2 as the developments would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road, these roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. In my opinion it is irresponsible to propose such large scale developments in an area, where the roads are already stretched to beyond capacity, with no likelihood of funding for improvements to become available, as considerable changes would be required to make these roads safer for people to use. This is the current situation before adding a further 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles and this is without the additional traffic which will be created by developments proposed for other areas that will also need to join these already overwhelmed roads.

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

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

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

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

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

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

How can it be considered sensible to build in an area where at present the roads cannot cope with the capacity of cars and so to build another 1,500 to 2,000 houses, which would result in an increase of traffic in the region of 3,000 to 4,000 cars is definitely unsustainable. Further-more the National Policy Statement for National Networks – December 2014 states the following:
Point 2.16 Traffic congestion constrains the economy and impacts negatively on quality of life by:

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

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

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

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

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

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

“All new development proposals should be located and designed to avoid reliance on the use of the private car and promote travel choice other than in exceptional circumstances. Permission will not be granted for development if it is not accessible by a choice of means of transport. Where necessary, measures to improve accessibility of development will be required (from the developer), particularly access by walking, cycling and public transport”.
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4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring.

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

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weelely Railway Station is also within reasonable walking distance. The frequency of the bus and rail service is limited with mostly one train per hour, no service on a Sunday and no direct route to London or Norwich.
So in my opinion they do not therefore provide a viable alternative to the private car for everyday travel as required for residential developments of this scale to be considered sustainable. The developments would fail against the social role set out in Paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and its Core Principle of making the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and would be contrary to Policy QL2 in the adopted Local Plan. The proposal should therefore not constitute sustainable development.

Infrastructure includes services, like education; the criteria required is flawed as one of the reasons Weeley was identified as a Key Rural Area for development is because of the misapprehension that Weeley has a Primary School, which in fact is not the case as indicated in the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) - Page 218 C30 Map 33 Weeley. Weeley village also does not have any facilities in the way of medical healthcare with there being neither doctors’ or dentists’ surgeries and so any developments would have to not just say that there would be a possibility of these services being provided but would need to deliver in order to comply with the Policy SP4.

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

The Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options Document (July 2016) states: 3.6 Air Quality and Noise

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and Weeley Railway Station is also within a reasonable walking distance, the frequency of the bus and rail service 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: P. GRIFFS
Address: Weeley
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, paragraphs 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 Tending District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

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

Name ...................................................... Signature ......................................................
Address ..........................................................

.................................................
Weeley, CO16

.................................................
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in 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. 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 Weele 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 ............................................ Signature ................................................
Address ..........................................

.................................................. ..........................
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on page 218 of Tendring District Local Plan – C30 Map 33 Weeley

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already agreed with in this District.

Name: Chamberlain Signature: 

Address:  

Dated: 21st August 2016

Planning Policy Team
Tendring District Council
Council Offices, Thorpe Road
Weeley, Essex, CO16 9AJ
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

Policy CP2 in the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) – Proposals which would have any adverse transport impacts will not be granted planning permission unless these are resolved and the development made acceptable by specific mitigation which are guaranteed to be implemented.
The proposed developments would be contrary to Paragraph 32 of the NPPF, Policy TR1a, SD8, CP1, CP2 as the developments would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road. These roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. In my opinion it is irresponsible to propose such large scale developments in an area, where the roads are already stretched to beyond capacity, with no likelihood of funding for improvements to become available, as considerable changes would be required to make these roads safer for people to use. This is the current situation before adding a further 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles and this is without the additional traffic which will be created by developments proposed for other areas that will also need to join these already overwhelmed roads.

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

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

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

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

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

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

How can it be considered sensible to build in an area where at present the roads cannot cope with the capacity of cars and so to build another 1,500 to 2,000 houses, which would result in an increase of traffic in the region of 3,000 to 4,000 cars is definitely unsustainable. Further-more the National Policy Statement for National Networks – December 2014 states the following:
Point 2.16 Traffic congestion constrains the economy and impacts negatively on quality of life by:

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.3.8 - Transport – whilst this section talks of the improvements that are planned by Highways England to local roads and the report written by them the Road Investment Strategy (2015 – 2020), there is no mention in this report of any investment being made to either the A120, A133 or any other roads within the Tendring district. Further still there is also no plans forth coming from Essex Highways with a view to now are in the near future to make any improvements to the road system in Tendring.

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

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

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

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

Name: MRS VERA MABLE
Address: WEELEY, ESSEX CO16 9AJ
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in 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 S08 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 in the Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

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

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

**Page 7 – Eligibility criteria**

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

**SIZE**

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

**Free-standing settlement**

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

**Local leadership and community support**

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

**Page 8**

**Local demand**

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

**Page 9**

**Infrastructure**

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

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

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

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

4. **Page 8 - Local demand**

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

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

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

5. **Page 9 - Infrastructure**

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

Policy SP4 – Infrastructure and Connectivity

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

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

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

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

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

The Local Plan for Weeley is not sustainable and is in breach of many of the Local Plan Policies and the National Planning Policy Framework, the developments would be contrary to Policy QL2, TR1a in the adopted Local Plan, Policy SD8 in the Tendring District Local Plan Pre-Submission Focused Changes and Policies CP1 and CP2 in the Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 25 in General Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Primary School</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>Defined village centre</th>
<th>Defined employment area</th>
<th>Railway Station</th>
<th>Good bus route</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TRIa in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

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

Name: S. Neal
Address: [blurred]
Signature: [blurred]
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 cut between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and Brightlingsea where there will be an increase in housing stock of 1,637 (included in this figure is 650 which are currently in the Appeals/Public Inquiry process); all these villages have more houses than Weeley, and so how can this statement be justified. In comparison Weeley a village on its own can accommodate a minimum of 1,425 an increase of 300% or above. In my opinion the total amount of housing development would be in excess of what could reasonably be considered a fair and proportionate increase in housing stock for one village.

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

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

Name: Corrine Greenleaf
Signature: [redacted]
Address: [redacted]
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 34 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 Bypass. 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).

Name ……………………………………… Signature ………………………………………
Address ………………………………………

[Redacted]
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in "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 besides 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).

Name \text {STAYLOR} \hspace{2cm} Signature \hspace{2cm} \text {WEELEY HEATH CO16}
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

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

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

Point 2.47 States – In applying a sustainable, fair and proportionate approach to the distribution of housing growth, the Smaller Urban Settlements will accommodate the second largest proportion of the District’s increase in housing stock over the plan period. This housing stock will be spread out between Frinton, Walton and Kirby Cross; Manningtree, Lawford and Mistley; and 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 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.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 65 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

Therefore anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name  S.NEwTON  Signature  
Address  WEELEY  
Heath Essex CO16  

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

By Planning Services

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

On page 65 of the Tending 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 and this does not include the additional traffic which will be caused through the developments proposed in Thorpe, Kirby, Clacton to name just a few.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: J. Botterell
Address: Weeley Heath, CO16

Date: 21st August 2016
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C: Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley.

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

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

In the Tendring District Council Planning Department – Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (April 2016) you describe the 5 categories 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 developments in an area, where the roads are already stretched to beyond capacity, with no likelihood of funding for improvements to become available, as considerable changes would be required to make these roads safer for people to use. This is the current situation before adding a further 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles.

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

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

Name ……………………………… Signature ………………………………
Address ……………………………… Weeley ………………………………
…………………………… Essex ……………………………… 2016
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

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

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 and this does not include the additional traffic which will be caused through the developments proposed in Thorpe, Kirby, Clacton to name just a few.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: 
Address: 

Signature: 
Weeley
Clacton on Sea CO16
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on page 10217 of G Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

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

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

- Joint 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 monstrously 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.
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 (July 2016) – Section 4.3.6 Air Quality and Noise

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and 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: WILLIAM ROBERTS
Address: [Redacted]
Signature: [Redacted]
I object to the proposals for Weele as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weele

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

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

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

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

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

It is in my opinion that the total amount of developments which have been proposed for Weele, as well as those that have already been approved (a total of 102 in 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 like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: [Emma Reed]
Address: [Redacted]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and 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 Habitats and so many more issues which it would cause, with no guarantee that these key areas would be addressed appropriately. It seems irresponsible for Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies to consider large scale developments without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already agued with in this District.

Name: [REDACTED]
Signature: [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).

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-develop is it 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.
By Planning Services

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already agued with in this District.

Name: W. WARRILLOW
Address: WEELEY, COLCHESTER, ESSEX, CO16
Signature: [Signature]

21st August 2016  Planning Policy Team  Tendring District Council  Council Offices, Thorpe Road  Weeley, Essex, CO16 9AJ
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

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

There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AMQAs) within Tendring District. Whilst this might currently be the state it will inevitably change for Weeley once you build 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 any more 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 ................................................ Weeley. ........................................
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name ........................................ Signature ........................................
Address ..................................................

..................................................
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 21 of C30 Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Primary School</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>Defined village centre</th>
<th>Defined employment area</th>
<th>Railway Station</th>
<th>Good bus route</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weeley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

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

Name ___________________________ Signature ___________________________
Address _____________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________
26th August 2016

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

The Sustainability Background Consultation (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: CHRISTOPHER ROSE
Address: Weeley
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 they are approximately 500 houses, currently in this area there has already been planning applications totalling 47 houses which is an increase of 9.5%. Whilst it is agreed that new houses are required, the proposal to build a further 1,500 to 2,000+ houses in a village of this size would amount to an additional increase of 300% to 400%, this is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 54 and so by affect is also contrary to Policy SP 1, SP 4, SP 5, SP 6 in Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016).

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

The proposed developments would be contrary to Paragraph 32 of the NPPF. Policy TR1a, SD8, CP1, CP2 as the developments would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road, these roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. In my opinion it is irresponsible to propose such large scale developments in an area, where the roads are already stretched to beyond capacity, with no likelihood of funding for improvements to become available, as considerable changes would be required to make these roads safer for people to use. This is the current situation before adding a further 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles and this does not include the additional traffic which will be caused through the developments proposed in Thorpe, Kirby, Clacton to name just a few.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

Name: Rebecca Rose

Address: [Redacted]

Signature: [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).

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 and this does not include the additional traffic which will be caused through the developments proposed in Thorpe, Kirby, Clacton to name just a few.

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

The proposed developments would be contrary to Paragraph 32 of the NPPF. Policy TR1a, SD8, CP1, CP2 as the developments would be routed onto the B1441 Weeley By-Pass, B1033 Colchester Road, B1033 Thorpe Road, these roads are already heavily used and are regularly congested, with traffic at peak times and during school holidays experiencing frequent traffic jams. In my opinion it is irresponsible to propose such large scale developments in an area, where the roads are already stretched to beyond capacity, with no likelihood of funding for improvements to become available, as considerable changes would be required to make these roads safer for people to use. This is the current situation before adding a further 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles 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.
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and 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: Benjamin May
Address: On Sea Essex CO15
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: Laura Deekes
Address: Weeley
Signed: [Blank]
Date: 27/8/16
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.

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**

While 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 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

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

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

National Policy Statement for National Networks December 2014

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

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

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

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

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

Name: [REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED] Weeley Clacton on Sea CO6
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Although these sites will be near a bus route and there are bus stops within reasonable walking distance and 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.
I object to the proposals for Weele as set out on Page 218 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weele

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

Travelling from Weeley to Colchester Hospital University Foundation Trust by car, a journey which should take approximately 20 minutes on a regular basis due to the amount of traffic will end up taking anything from 40 minutes to an hour. This journey would still take 46 minutes by train and bus or 1hr 19 minutes by bus alone, which if you are elderly, frail or disabled is not possible. The infrastructure in Tendring can be considered poor at best and the risk with these proposed developments for all of Tendring, is that far from improving the situation it will just put more strain on services which are already at breaking point.

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

Name: Mrs. Rita Bailey
Address: Weeley, Essex, CO16 9AJ

Signature:

Date: 21st August 2016
Proposed Local Plan

We strongly oppose the proposed plan to develop Weeley Village. The area already has numerous new builds under construction which is already effecting roads, (main & side), causing congestion, lack of green spaces & flooding causes us great concern, no consideration has been given to the quality of life of the Weeley residents.

May we suggest you rethink this plan & look at other available land in areas such as Horseley Cross.

Yours Faithfully,
Dear Sir or Madam,

Tendring District Local Plan - Case 16

In September 2008 we retired and downgraded to Wesley from Brentwood. We were looking for a detached bungalow and after viewing several new builds in the area we opted for Fenticle Close, Wesley. We were delighted to find the property which was at the top of the close and which had the largest plot on the development and was furthest away from the main road. To the rear of the property there is open fields etc and was unobstructed by any other properties, with this in mind we went ahead with purchase.

We were advised that there had been previous application to develop the land at the rear, mainly owned by Rainbow Nursery and numbers 1-4 Fenticle Close, but all had been refused and building on this land was expected certainly never happen.

The new proposal if it goes ahead would mean that property could be built directly at the rear of our house opposite two houses and we would be totally against this.

Finally if this development goes ahead there would be a devaluation of our property, would this be compensated by either the developer or council? we doubt this.

Yours Sincerely
Re: Representation for Tendring District Local Plan

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

[Signature]

J Crosby
Re: Representation for Tendring District Local Plan

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

J Simpson
Re: Representation for Tendring District Local Plan

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 Fuller
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

M Fuller
Received On
08 SEP 2016
By Planning Services

Re: Representation for Tendring District Council Local Plan

I am very concerned at the proposed large development at weely which I think will blight the approach to not only Weeley but Little Clacton, Thorpe-le-Soken, The Kirby’s, Frinton-on-Sea and Walton.

I am also concerned at the large scale developments in Clacton encroaching upon Little Clacton. My view is some of the aforesaid developments could be accommodated by Weeley, Weeley Heath, and Little Clacton along the old A133.

Developments like Cravenwood are superb, possible sites include, The Pig Farm (Weeley Heath), Kidbys Nursery (Weeley Heath), the area abutting Barnfields (Weeley Heath), Connaught Road (Weeley Heath), Bateman Road (Little Clacton) – this would tidy-up an area of Little Clacton and a large development in the middle of Little Clacton on open land at land west of The Street, Swains Farm (Little Clacton).

These developments would have the benefit of two very large sustainable villages and already have the road and rail infrastructure.

Should you require any further information/clarification or site plans/locations please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully

J Barrington-Fuller
Re: Representation for Tendring District Local Plan

Dear Sirs

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

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

2. Connaught Road, Weelely 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 Fuller
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.

Signed

Date 5th Sept 2016

Name
ISABELLE A. PAGE
ERIC E. PAGE
Address
WEELEY COUL
Received On
08 SEP 2015
By Planning Services

Tendring District Council's Local Plan for Weeley and Surrounding Areas.

We don't think the local structure in any way meets the requirements for any more large developments.

What with the roads as they are—and they can't cope—schools that are barely large enough now, Dr's surgeries that are packed and local hospitals which already have severe problems—what do we see just adding to the problems.

Over development will cause water problems as the sewers have a problem as it is—any large development would only add to that unless a new sewage system is put in.

We have had several power cuts lately and they don't seem to be able to cope with them either.

It will no longer be a village—why do you think we and many others have lived here most of our lives or have returned here to be with our families. No doubt a lot of the people will be 'Tuniers' and will only want to continue with their Town style of living and Weeley residents lives will be completely turned upside-down.

We appreciate new houses are needed but do they need to be done in one hit and "Weeley. It is our youngsters will not be able to afford the type of housing that is proposed and so
It is a matter we thought that everybody (including T.D.C.) wanted to help the environment and wildlife - how will this be possible if all the development goes ahead.

Also most of the land to be used is, as has been up until now, good agricultural land - our country's security could still help to be self-sufficient and save our miles, etc.

We hope that T.D.C. will seriously consider minimising any development that has to go up and you will consider the younger set of our village.

Yours faithfully

(Signed)

(Signed)
Objection to the Proposed Local Plan.

Dear Sir,

The proposed development of Weeley Village and Weeley Heath are totally disproportionate and detrimental to the rural nature of the area. Destroying good agricultural land. It seems unacceptable the level of development being proposed. It will change Weeley Village to a town. Surely this is unfair on the Local Community.

The land proposed according to the plan. Itself not very self-explanatory!!! Borders our back garden fence in Waylands Drive, Weeley. This would mean the loss of at least 15 trees. Thus destroying the habitat for many birds, including many migrating birds and other wildlife. It would mean destroying new stables, a new manure and paddocks, plus a surrounding garden. Not exactly eco-friendly. This would encroach on our privacy and may result in loss of light as our properties are bungalows with small gardens. The plan also borders the cemetery. The new cremators are considerably noisy. Not desirable to live near. When purchasing our bungalow our survey flagged up contaminated land nearby. The Council seems to have ignored the rural nature of Weeley. St. Andrews Church for example standing alone in beautiful surroundings. Rural England belongs to everyone. The more people live in cities the more they seek the peace and beauty.

Health and well-being,

Local doctors surgeries struggle to cope with demand. How will they cope with an enormous increase in population in Weeley and surrounding areas marked for development. Doctors difficult to recruit. Reluctant to come to this area. The same for schools and teachers. At present there is only one main hospital which is in Colchester, serving both Tendring and (and...
Colchester. At present in special measures. With the vast development under construction in Colchester alone. How will this hospital cope.

INFRASTRUCTURE.

Where are all the people going to work. Colchester road in Wheelea needs total improvement with more and more heavy vehicles using it. The main route to Thorpe/Kirby/Frinton and Walton. Extra thousands of cars are not going to improve the present holdups experienced daily on the A120/133 not to mention the A12. This will not encourage tourists to visit here. They come for the rural nature scene and peace and quiet not to be stuck in traffic. The volume of traffic increases considerably in the summer months. Taking up to 10 mins to exit our towns. Plus increase pressure on the utility companies with more homes proposed.

RAIL TRANSPORT

Poor - One local station - lack of fast service to London. This will not attract commuters who need to commute to London for work or pleasure.

2011 LOCALISM ACT

Is Tendring Council going to give the Weeley Community the right to shape developments in their area. Not the proposed plan for massive over development which will ruin Weeley for ever as we know it today.

PA Coleman & N J Coleman

Weeley 2016

6th September 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 R Clay
Address C016 Weeley
Signed
Date 5/9/16
Objection to the Proposed Local Plan (Weeley/TDC)

- **Policy SP3 –Sustainable Deign** 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: ________________________________
R. Clay

Address: ________________________________
Weeley, post code: CO16

Date: 3/9/16
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 21 in C Local Maps – C30 Map 33 Weeley

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

The proposed developments would be contrary to Paragraph 32 of the NPFR, 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.

I fore anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already plagued with in this District.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name: C. Hollo Boue
Address: 123 Street, Tendring
Signature: [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>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Address: .................................................................
I object to the proposals for Weeley as set out on Page 218 in C1 Local Plans - 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>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeley Heath</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So contrary to the statement on page 29 paragraph 3: These are the Key Rural Service Centres identified in the 2012 Draft Local Plan and so from this exercise it appears that no change in approach is needed for the new version of the Local Plan, the information has been misrepresented and so therefore Weeley does not score 4 and so cannot be identified as a Key Rural Service Centre.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

Policy SDS8 in the Tendring District Local Plan: Pre-Submission Focused Changes states that developments will only be acceptable if the additional vehicular movements likely to result from the development can be accommodated within the capacity of the existing or improved highway network or would not lead to an unacceptable increase in congestion.
Policy CP1 in the Tendring District Local Plan – Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) – proposals for new development must be sustainable in terms of transport and accessibility and therefore should include and encourage opportunities for access to sustainable modes of transport, including walking, cycling and public transport.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Page 7 – Eligibility criteria

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

SIZE

3. 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 300 to 1,100 as discussed by the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation Document (July 2016) and previous versions of the Local Plan in land allocated south of the railway line running along beside the Weeley Bridge Caravan Leisure Park and up to the Bowling Green Roundabout.

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

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

4. **Page 8 - Local demand**

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

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

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

5. **Page 9 - Infrastructure**

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

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

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: [Redacted]  
Signature: [Redacted]  
Address: [Redacted]  
Date: 26th August 2016  
Tendring District Council  
Council Offices, Thorpe Road  
Weeley, 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  Linda Backhouse

Address  [Redacted]

Signed [Redacted]

Date  27/8/16
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 TRIa in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

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

Name Alan Clark
Address Weeley CO16
Policy TR1a in the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) (the adopted Local Plan) requires that development affecting highways be considered in relation to reducing and preventing hazards and inconvenience to traffic including the capacity of the road network.

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

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

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

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

Before anymore developments are carried out within this area I would think it was essential to consider these points and so many more like healthcare services, schools and quality of life for people living in a rural community. I personally do not know how Tendring District Council along with other governing bodies can consider another development without addressing the problems and poor infrastructure which we are already lagged with in this District.