

Appendix 1 Representations on Place Policies and Allocations – Key Issues

(Note this summary is of the key issues only to provide an overview in relation to the Place Policies in the referred Options Local Plan. (Full representations will be analysed when considering responses and amendments required to the Plan.)

Note: numbers may vary from the table in the report because representations relating to supporting paragraphs have been included along with representations about related policies.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
Cross Boundary Garden Communities		
Policy SP8: East Colchester/West Tendring New Garden Community	101 Plus a petition with 733 signatures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect Salary Brook area, hillside overlooking Salary Brook Valley. Concern over impact on ecological assets including wildlife. Natural History Society would prefer Salary Brook contained within wider nature reserve rather than country park to protect site's integrity. Inclusion of Churn Wood in GI network welcomed. Sir Bob Russell – open countryside east of Greenstead as far as the eye can see. • Development would be in Tendring but would rely on infrastructure paid for by Colchester residents. • Direct development elsewhere. Alternative proposals include brownfield sites in East Colchester urban area; Weeley new town; and deprived towns like Clacton and Harwich where infrastructure can support development. • A120/133 link road should be constructed and transit link operational before new dwellings occupied. Local roads improved before development. Cycle path improvements; a new part and ride scheme; and dedicated bus lanes needed along with equestrian access. • Development would overload infrastructure, including roads, schools, healthcare and sewage. Traffic congestion already bad, particularly on Clingoe Hill. Facilities already under pressure including local primaries, surgeries and Colne Community School/Colchester secondary schools.

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<p>. Infrastructure in place before building commences. Commitment from partner organisations needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extra burden of traffic through Wivenhoe of commuters using railway station. • Impacts on waste water treatment, flood management. • Loss of top grade agricultural land. • Preferred option needs further work to reassure local residents that it can deliver improved quality of life for both existing and new residents. • Social housing provision needed. • Concerns over proximity with Greenstead and Longridge. Buffer zone needed as proposed for Elmstead Market. Development should be over brow of Salary Brook hill so it is out of sight of existing residents. • Noise from development will affect existing residents. • Objects to development, but if built then 15 pitch Gypsy and Traveller site should be included. • Environment Agency –Support high proportion of green infrastructure for area found in plan. Advise that the outer boundary of new Salary Brook country park should be commensurate with the outer boundary of Flood Zone 2 to avoid development in flood risk areas. • RSPB - Specific protection for protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets required. • Historic England – difficult to comment on impact without knowing boundaries. • ECC – New 2 form entry primary school required in early phases; second new 2 forms of entry later in plan period, plus potential expansion of existing primary to account for additional east Colchester growth. New 4 form secondary school needed for early phases followed by expansion to accommodate 9-12 forms. Full package of

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<p>transport measure to be developed through masterplan framework. Strategic link road needed between A120 and A133.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University – objects to deletion of land allocated for future campus expansion to the southwest unless alternative allocation made in Colchester or Tendring plan.
Policy SP9: West Colchester/East Braintree New Garden Community	<p>259</p> <p>Plus a Petition from CAUSE– 8,482 signatures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will create urban sprawl of Colchester, destroy rural character. • New residents will be London commuters, but rail is inadequate. • Infrastructure already inadequate – roads, rail, schools, hospital all not able to support high levels of new growth. No new housing until infrastructure built, including roads – A12 tripled, A120 dualled; dedicated bus routes; station properly connected to community; funding for rail capacity increases, school and health facilities provided. • Loss of agricultural land. • Questions about economic viability given lack of established employment generators. Risk of commuter community. Need early investment in employment. • Garden Communities can't be guaranteed to be accepted and in place within timeframe – transport infrastructure delivery will take time. • Make clear that delivery vehicle will be responsible for master planning. • Development is too big. • Increase in pollution, noise and fumes. • Use sites in existing built up areas. • No Infrastructure Delivery Plan or full transport modelling to accompany proposal. • Increased likelihood of flooding. • Any new town should have its own centre and identity.

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of evidence for town of this size at this time. Housing numbers lack credibility. • North Essex authorities lack experience, expertise and resources to implement Garden Communities. • Environment Agency – supportive of policy. Foul drainage capacity will need to be upgraded. • RSPB – sections on masterplanning should specify that green infrastructure provision should be described. Need to secure management of biodiversity assets. • Historic England – difficult to comment on impact without seeing boundaries of what is proposed. • ECC – New primary required in early phases of development, second primary later in plan period. Some expansion of Honywood School and Thurstable School possible, but new secondary school needed before end of plan period. Full package of transport measure need to be developed through masterplan framework.
CENTRAL COLCHESTER: TOWN CENTRE	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure consideration given to flood risk issues reflected in the Surface Water management Plan – discuss with ECC as the LLFA • Differentiate between evening and night time economy • Support continued commitment to the town centre • Concerns about student accommodation • Welcome regeneration but seek to safeguard Sainsbury's in Priory Walk • Support threshold for retail impact assessment, but question requirement for RIA in centre outside of Town Centre • Alternative sliding scale for requirements retail impact assessments suggested for district and local centres
Policy TC1: Town Centre Policy and Hierarchy	20	

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Floorspace requirements outside of town centre are not justified Support the hierarchy with Town centre at the top and the 3 rural district centres. Reserve position in respect of Garden Communities and centre designation. Welcome a change in respect of Urban district centres New Sainsbury's at the Hythe should be a new district centre Support role of the town centre as a cultural hub Reference to Jumbo / Balmerne Gate and its importance and public realm should be included in the Plan and afforded some priority
Policy TC2: Retail Frontages	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approach supported but justification required Map / key to better reflect Policy reference Support bringing sentiments of Better Town Centre SPD to fore. Mention of safeguarding enhancing key heritage assets should be added eg St Botolph's Priory/ Roman Wall
Policy TC3: Town Centre Allocations	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan does not set out justification for meeting the floorspace requirements No sequential test has been carried out to accommodate this floorspace need for retail uses Sequential test should include existing District Centres including Tollgate Village Reference to key heritage assets should be made in these allocation policies Objections to Housing allocation at Britannia Car Park- Loss of car park space and impact on traffic, and use for the school and church University accommodation to be provided closer to the Campus rather than within Town Centre area
NORTH COLCHESTER	9	

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
Policy NC1: North Colchester and Severalls Strategic Economic Area	20	Note comments overlap in respect of various elements of Policy NC1 (eg Comments on Housing allocation at the Rugby Club are not just confined only to this element.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zone 1 - Strategic Employment Area 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed suggestions for reconfiguration of the land within the 3 zones; Inclusion of additional areas of land within the SEA including land to the north and south of the traveller site and land around Cuckoo farm Studios Detailed policy wording amendments proposed regarding uses permitted; Inconsistent approach with other Strategic Economic Areas in particular Stanway; Support additional community facilities in relation to need –reference identified need for a place of Worship in this area which could be accommodated as part of community provision Other uses should be specified in the policy for zone 2 Concern about infrastructure capacity including A12 from traffic generated by uses associated with policy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zone 2 - Cuckoo Farm North West 	1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zone 3 - Northern Gateway area north of the A12 	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land at the Rugby Club 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No residential provision on this site Loss of open space Loss of sports field and the lack of local facilities for local sport, displacing sports including American Football, Cricket and Rugby League; Rugby Club receiving preferential treatment to other sporting activities / local clubs Sports provision proposed as part of Northern gateway Strategic Proposals is insufficient to meet the growing needs; Number of houses should be increased to 300 allowing for higher density and higher rise development; Additional / alternative sites proposed on land including;

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposal for extra care retirement village to provide 250 mixed tenure extra care units within Policy Area NC1 (no site definition specified) (in addition to other housing allocated within this policy area) ○ Land at Oxley Parker Drive (area of open public open space) ○ Land At Axial Way -reinforcemet of current planning position (retention of site for housing)
Policy NC2: North Station Special Policy Area	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consideration is given to fluvial or surface water flooding; • The sequential test must be applied for all sources of flooding; • The area encompasses a Critical Drainage Area; • Turner Rise should be incorporated within the boundary of the policy area; • Traffic problems at North Station will get worse as more homes are built; • Direct and rapid transport links to North Station are required from other parts of the town; in particular the East, including the University; • One of the key radial links on the Colchester Orbital is via Castle Park and through High Woods; • A designated bus for the town centre from the station ticket office is required.
Policy NC3: North Colchester	27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure capacity • Capacity of B1508 • Impact on North Station Junction; • Not able to absorb this as well as Chesterwell development (1600) • Contrary to the M&B NHP • Highways England- objection to any development to the North of Colchester
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential Allocations 	3	

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for sites from the site promoters • Alternative sites proposed on land including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Land at Bakers Lane Land east of Bakers Lane 7.53 ha plus land west of Bakers Lane 1.29 ha (adjacent to ramparts farm. ○ Further land at Bakers Lane- 1.95 ha. ○ Land at St John's Road (39 ha)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land At St Botolph's Farm Braiswick 	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of green space • Detrimental Impact on wildlife • Reduces separation between Colchester and W Bergholt (coalescence) • Access within the 60 mile per hour section of Road • Suggested that Site falls within EH protected land Moat Farm National Monument 1019964 • Site unsuitable as subject to subsidence; • Flood risk on part of site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land north of Achnacone Drive Braiswick 	31*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on Amenity of area • Detrimental effect on character of residential area • Safety for users of Achnacone Drive • Road too narrow – not suited to increase or construction traffic • Suggested that Site falls within EH protected land Moat Farm National Monument 1019964
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land south of Braiswick Golf Club 	18*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor access to site • Narrow access – difficult for service vehicles; • Backland development • Detrimental to amenity of existing residents • Over development

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of trees
EAST COLCHESTER		
Knowledge Gateway and University Strategic Economic Area	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to make reference to urgent need for additional housing to match the expected growth at the Knowledge Gateway Policy should refer to the many heritage assets on the site including Grade ii* listed Wivenhoe House and the Register Park and Garden Environment Agency suggest reference in the policy to the avoidance of development within the flood plain at Salary Brook Similar allocation should be included in the Tendring Local Plan as largely in TDC area. TDC acknowledge joint working and further discussion regarding boundary TDC also raise concern regarding any additional housing in the east of Colchester over and above that as part of the Garden Community Support for the recognition and importance of University and its contribution to growth and in particular incubator units Remember expansion allocation comes with the expectation for the deallocation of land to the south for university expansion
Policy EC1: Knowledge Gateway and University of Essex Strategic Economic Area	10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zone 1 Knowledge Gateway 	1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zone 2 University Expansion 	1	
East Colchester/Hythe Special Policy Area	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need ensure full consideration of flood risk issues in this area with strategic approach between EA / CBC/ AW/ ECC (as the LLFA). EA seek further discussion on Flood risk issues here including ref to DM23 and pragmatic management of flood risk in this area Reference to surcharging of surface sewers to be added to text as this is where infrastructure investment is viatl for future regeneration in this areas Reference to CIL / Contributions to be levied to support water infrastructure Policy should be less prescriptive and more flexible New Sainsbury's store should be designated as a new "centre"
Policy EC2: East Colchester Hythe Special Policy Area	9	

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regeneration needs to consider biodiversity and also reference should be made to heritage assets as well as environmental assets and refer to opportunities to enhance such assets • Policy should also acknowledge suitability for high rise development and formal sports provision • particularly important that development proposals are subject to scrutiny and the application of appropriate design and build principles. We would like these sites to be explicitly referred to in the Local Plan • Suggest plan states a desire to support the establishment of properly constituted local groups committed to driving appropriate development - such as CLTs. • Suggest mention of a desire to help identify assets suitable for community ownership/and or management (with due regard to the effect this might have on affordability/viability). • Hythe Forward would appreciate the opportunity for further dialogue and trust that our submission reflects shared strategic objectives of Colchester Borough Council and Hythe Forward CLT
Policy EC3: East Colchester	5	Alternative sites proposed by representations; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ * Place Farm 5.5ha allocated as employment as part of Whitehall Industrial Estate ○ Middlewick Ranges (Rep includes details including reference for up to 2000 dwellings on 84.69 ha)
Port Lane	3*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over capacity especially traffic for accumulative delivery of housing with east Colchester / Hythe area. (In view of this is it right to lose Britannia Car park yet?) • Detailed points regarding pavements / parking / gardens and lighting referenced for planning conditions

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit to 115 dwellings so not overly crammed in
East Bay Mill	4*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correct reference to Exception test – DCLG not Environment Agency Support reference theme of riverside walks as part of regeneration encouraged
Magdalen Street Sites	5*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern over capacity especially traffic for accumulative delivery of housing with east Colchester / Hythe area. (In view of this is it right to lose Britannia Car park yet?) More Almshouses are needed in area for elderly population Traffic management could include congestion based charge for non-access through traffic Brook St, Magdalen Street and Barrack Street. Proximity to town centre should mean no requirement for car parking spaces
Employment Sites	2*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support proposals Area of extension at Whitehall Industrial Estate includes 5.5ha at Place Farm which is not considered viable for employment and should instead in part contribute to Housing Supply which will help deliver employment on remainder (also listed with alternative site above*)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Economic Areas 	1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whitehall Industrial Estate 	1	
WEST COLCHESTER	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns expressed about impact on road infrastructure in particular A12 junction Roads are inadequate and need traffic management Safeguard roman river – protect its history Area incorrectly shown as Public open space (part of MOD land)
Policy WC1: Stanway Strategic Economic Area	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objections to the removal of Urban District Centre (also comment supporting the approach proposed in the PO) Approach inconsistent with that of North Colchester Object to safeguarding for b class uses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zone 1 	6	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zone 2 	4	

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative configuration part of this site and other land with part of Lakelands • Need to consider detailed amenity and place making and adequate infrastructure provision • Reallocate the Trafalgar Farm area as Employment- no longer in Agriculture use
Stanway Area Housing/Other Allocations	3	Alternative sites promoted via representations; Site Locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lexden School site and Essex Fire Brigade Workshop site - Lambert Smith Hampton Representations – to include both sites in settlement boundary ○ Land to the South and West of Lakelands- reconfiguration of the Preferred Options allocation for 150 dwellings and employment ○ Additional land at Lakelands (not identified by allocation in the PO) ○ Land north west of 296 London Road 130 dwellings See also sites suggested under WC4 – alternative options
Policy WC2: Stanway	9	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land between Church Lane, Churchfields and Partridge Way 	28*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be retained as open space • Status of site in adopted Local Plan- open space • Site promoter confirms delivery (Flagship Housing)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Fiveways Fruit Farm 	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for robust transport plan / strategy • Safeguard trees in area and open spaces
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Chitts Hill 	4*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site does not have good access to bus travel; • School capacity / infrastructure • Question access restrictions and maximum number (promoter)

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land to the West of Lakelands 	4*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public rights of way Open space Alternative configuration part of this site and other land with part of Lakelands
Colchester Zoo	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for Masterplan approach Essential to consider junction improvements and transport and access strategy for the zoo and in the wider context. Support reference to Mineral safeguarding and associated requirements Details comments regarding policy wording on public rights of way and protection / enhancement biodiversity / environmental assets. Support in principle to approach Policy should include reference to Surface water management and SuDs
Policy WC3: Colchester Zoo	7	
Policy WC4: West Colchester	8	General comments from ECC on WC4 – total development 308 dwellings: further expansion of primary provision would be required; plans for secondary schools in area would allow the provision of additional secondary places to serve this area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land at Gosbecks Phase 2 	2*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic England welcome policy wording in respect of scheduled monument and archaeological potential. Not acceptable location so close to a historic site. It would create an even higher throughput of traffic for cyclists and horse riders to have to deal with when exercising in the area. Crossing Maldon Road as it is horrible. it should be made clear improved public transport services and infrastructure would be required

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support from the site promoter with some suggested amendments to policy wording / requirements including to read approximately 150 dwellings and other details which will be considered by the planning application process;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> South of Berechurch Hall Road 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ECC – no public transport services along Berechurch Hall Road. ECC – the paragraph (6.87) refers to access onto Berechurch Road. Suggest this should be Berechurch Hall Road. <p>Promoter of 2 of the 3 land parcels supports allocation and has begun discussions with land owners of remaining land parcel.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land at Irvine Road 	9*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RSPB – support policy regarding Ecological Management Plan. Recommend provisions made to secure long term ecological management of the site; ECC – require clarification on access arrangements if there is no public access to this land (para 6.88); Comment regarding ensuring Norman Way remains as a bridleway; IRARA wish Orchard protected and managed and object to allocation. If policy WC4 is retained measures are needed to guarantee security of remaining Orchard land – ownership of remaining land transferred to a body with the Orchard's wildlife at its heart. Colchester Civic Society – object as one of a tiny handful of old orchards left in the country. It should be managed properly as a community asset. If this is promoted so should sit at Highfield Drive be? Support on behalf of the site promoter
Alternative Option	2	Alternative sites proposed on sites including;

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Land North of St Albans Road x ○ Land at Highfield Drive x
GARDEN COMMUNITIES	6	Comments relating to the Garden Community proposals refer to issues above under SP8 and SP9
SUSTAINABLE SETTLEMENTS		Note generic comment from Essex County Council on School Places (not repated in each settlement but potentially relevant to all: ECC have said in many cases the Primary School places can be accommodated either in existing school places or in expanded schools, they have also stated that there might be an impact from the accumulation of new school places needed if new houses are also built in adjacent villages. Also, in most cases they have said there will be implications on Secondary School places with development. These will need to be addressed by appropriate contributions / expansion as required at the tme.
ABBERTON AND LANGENHOE	1	General Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not need additional housing; • Not a sustainable settlement; • Speeding traffic through village, inadequate footways; • School would need expansion; • School parking issues; • Need for starter homes in the village; • Sites will require screening under HRA due to proximity to Abberton Reservoir SPA/Ramsar site; • Visibility issues at Peldon Road/Layer Road junction identified by ECC.
Policy SS1: Abberton and Langenhoe Housing Sites	44	Peldon Road site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would disconnect listed building from rural context (Pete Tye House); • Peldon Road rural character, ditched hedges;

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised proposal received from promoter for up to 50 homes on just on west side of Peldon Road with potential for village car park or financial contribution. <p>Ashpark House site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access along privately owned drive; Impact on many native species including nightingales; Rear gardens in Peldon Road flood; Representation received from promoter to enlarge site to 10 dwellings
BIRCH	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of infrastructure eg no medical facilities or shops; High levels of traffic already on road; Parking issues at school; Consideration needs to be given to neighbouring Listed Buildings; Need a range of affordable properties; Early years and Primary School could accommodate growth; Site will require screening under HRA due to proximity to Abberton Reservoir SPA/Ramsar site; Additional information provided by promotor for two development options. <p>Alternative site promoted via representation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land at Birch Business Park, Maldon Road, Birch.
Policy SS2: Land East of Birch Street	14	
BOXTED	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of infrastructure at Hill Farm site; Support for continued small scale employment use on Hill Farm Site; Lack of consultation on Neighbourhood Plan; No early years or Primary School capacity issues; Development should consider impact on Listed Building.
Policy SS3: Boxted Housing Sites	8	

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
CHAPPEL		
Policy SS4: Chappel Housing Sites	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking issues at Swan Grove; • Too many houses for the site/capacity of the village infrastructure; • Support for proposal from Parish Council – some comments on Policy wording. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vernon's Road: 21 dwellings • Spring Gardens: 21 dwellings <p>Land to west of Bures Road with recreation provision off Colchester Road (north): 50 dwellings</p>
COPFORD AND COPFORD GREEN	5	<p>Hall Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing numbers too large/disproportionate level of growth; • Alternative brownfield sites in Copford should be delivered first; • No capacity at Copford Primary School; • No mention of affordable housing, density and mix important; • Lack of adequate infrastructure; • Environmental impacts on Roman River Valley; • Loss of agricultural land; • High traffic volumes <p>Alternative sites promoted via representations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • London Road Marks Tey (Car Boot Sale Site): 60-70 dwellings; site previously assessed in SLAA; <p>Renzlands & Telephone exchange: site suggested – not by land owner; no information provided.</p>
Policy SS5: Copford Housing Sites	39	
DEDHAM AND DEDHAM HEATH	4	Corner of The Heath and Long Road West

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
Policy SS6: Dedham Heath Housing Sites	74 Plus a petition with 168 signatures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on AONB; • Traffic congestion/safety; • Sewage/surface water drainage issues; • Impact on Listed Building; • Covenant preventing development on the land. <p>North of Long Road East</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on AONB and prominence of the site when viewed from the north within the AONB; • Traffic congestion/safety; • Sewage/surface water drainage issues; • Impact on Listed Building (Old Church House); • Layouts submitted by site promoter. <p>South of Long Road East</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on AONB; • Traffic congestion/safety; • Sewage/surface water drainage issues; • Support from site promoter but no new information submitted. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North of Long Road East: approx. 5 dwellings • Back land development using Sun Downe for access: 17 dwellings; site previously assessed.
EIGHT ASH GREEN		
Policy SS7: Eight Ash Green	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing numbers shouldn't be minimum; • Impact on A12 Junction 26; • Impact on Listed Building setting;

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School capacity issues – ECC consider primary school could potentially expand; Surface water flooding risk; Development should be split between Fiddlers Farm site and land north of Halstead Road. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Halstead Road East: 61 dwellings; site assessed previously in SLAA (RNW09); Halstead Road: 30 or care home; site assessed previously in SLAA (STN20); Brick & Tile PH site, Halstead Road: 8 dwellings Halstead Road adjacent Choats Hill SB: approx. 25 dwellings
FORDHAM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fordham PC support proposed number of dwellings; Primary School can accommodate growth, Early Years has current capacity; Proposed location should be nearer village; Increased risk of accident and noise; Further information provided by site promoter with regard to highway access.
Policy SS8: Fordham	7	
GREAT HORKESLEY	5	<p>Great Horkesley Manor site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing not needed, Gt Horkesley should remain a village; Congestion in village and around North Station will get worse; Pressure on infrastructure; No local shops and amenities; Children would have to cross busy road;
Policy SS9: Great Horkesley	44	

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No safe pedestrian route along A134, pavements narrow and speeding traffic; • Access to Myland should be improved; • Loss of agricultural land; • Lack of development for employment; • Parish Council support both sites; • Query over need to expand village hall; • Additional information provided by site promoter regarding omitted land.
GREAT TEY	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school capacity and growth can be accommodated; • Parish Council support proposal but consideration to investigate traffic calming measures including footway; • Opportunities should be explored to upgrade PROW to bridleway; • Concern regarding development on a very narrow country road; • Road has existing parking issues; • Access issues into site, safe access/exit; • Question ability to provide safe footway; • Support from site promoter. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land between Greenfield Drive and Newbarn Road: 40 dwellings plus 1ha public open space adjacent to existing sports pitches.
Policy SS10: Great Tey	11	
LANGHAM	2	<p>General comments – all sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total number of houses too high and not proportionate, should not be higher than 85 dwellings; • Will become suburb of Colchester;
Policy SS11: Langham	70	

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
	Plus a petition with 267 signatures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate infrastructure and facilities; • Traffic on School Road – accident risk for school children; • Inadequate public transport; • Development could have an impact on substandard A12 junction (Highways England); • Development would impact on AONB - landscape assessment required for sites near AONB; • Land use conflict – industry/school/housing; • Lack of evidence during consultation; • Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land currently actively farmed. <p>Wick Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impact on Listed Building; • Supported by Parish Council for frontage development. <p>School Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Council support frontage development of site to right of Powerplus but consider site selected hadn't received proper identification earlier as a potential site. Object to estate development, total number due to impact on School Road, effect on village character; • Development would affect historic character of Bosted Airfield; • Upgrades to School Road needed; • Inadequate drainage; • Move industry away; • Availability confirmed of Powerplus. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Langham Cottage, 9 High Street: 1 to 4 dwellings; • Lodge Lane: commercial 1.76ha existing; 1 ha potential new;

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extension to Powerplus site: commercial 1.06ha extension; Land at Perry Grove: 5 dwellings; previously assessed in SLAA (RNE06).
LAYER DE LA HAYE	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments range from 50 houses too much to support for 50 houses (no more); Opposition to proposed site access; Existing infrastructure and facilities inadequate; Primary school could accommodate growth; Screening site under HRA required; Site promoter request amend polity to read approx. 50 dwellings; Site promoter provided additional information including illustrative pla and delivery statement; Challenge raised over the proposed removal of Malting Green settlement boundary. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Malting Green: 10 dwellings; previously assessed (RSE09)
Policy SS12: Layer de la Haye	42	
MARKS TEY	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marks Tey Parish Council - SS13 should be unchanged until further clarity of wider strategic implications are clear. Investigation should be undertaken to explore innovative ways by which evolving Neighbourhood Plan can link into wider strategy to form a Neighbourhood Plan 'plus'. Environment Agency – expansion of Copford facility needed. Highways England – Development here would have severe impact on the Strategic Road Network. Proposals to widen both A120 and A12 may affect the site.
Policy SS13: Marks Tey	20	

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England – significant number of grade II listed buildings in Marks Tey which need consideration in determination of growth proposals. • Natural England – need to have regard to Marks Tey Brickpit SSSI and findings of Habitat Regulations Assessment to be carried out. • Proposals for small sites in Marks Tey area put forward by landowners/developers. • Objections to Garden Community proposals for area.
ROWHEDGE	18	Battleswick Farm
Policy SS14: Rowhedge	204	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield/agricultural land; • Impact on doctors surgery; • Impact on Primary School – school cannot expand; • Cumulative impact on infrastructure and facilities with other new developments; • Flooding issues; • Loss of hedgerows; • Coalescence with Old Heath; • Overlooking on to existing properties; • No further information submitted by site promoter. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rowhedge Business Centre: 60 dwellings
TIPTREE	15	Neighbourhood Plan will define Settlement Boundary and allocate specific sites. Comments on direction of growth: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing numbers; • Cross boundary issues;
Policy SS15: Tiptree	35	

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longstanding access problems to A12; • School capacity – surplus capacity exists but there will be additional required, including Secondary expansion and new Early Years facility needed; • Flood risk; • Map changes/corrections needed; • Additional information provided by site promoters – additional highway information to support site TIP09 and additional information to support sites TIP03, TIP10 and TIP11. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rhubarb Hall, Grove Road: approx. 10 dwellings (previously assessed TIP11); • Brook Meadow, Tiptree: 100 dwellings (previously assessed (TIP03); • Bull Lane: 74 dwellings (previously assessed TIP10); • Land off B1022 Maypole Road: no number dwellings specified; • Extra Care Home, Factory Hill: 80 units; • Grove Road Tiptree: 75-80 dwellings & 25/30 affordable; • Wood Lane: no number dwellings specified.
WEST BERGHOLT		Neighbourhood Plan will define Settlement Boundary and allocate specific sites. Comments on direction of growth:
Policy SS16: West Bergholt	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer contributions would be required to expand early years facilities; • School could accommodate level of growth; • Neighbourhood Plan should include SuDs requirements; • Parish Council request policy read 100 dwellings and suggest that 20 dwellings will be provided in settlement boundary; • Parish Council request other areas to be identified as Local Economic Areas;

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parish Council would like to see area of West Bergholt to be designated as Special Character Area, and area south of village to be designated as Special Landscape; Limiting development to 120 homes may prevent Parish from delivering wider benefits – should be at least 150 homes as per Eight Ash Green; Policy aimed at preventing coalescence is welcomed – concern over development in Braiswick; Promoter of alternative site disagrees with broad areas of growth – disregards other suitable sites; Question designation of Pattens Yard given unsustainable location; <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colchester Road (WBG03 & WBG04): sites previously assessed – objection on broad areas of growth and further information provided; Cooks Hall Lane: 3 dwellings; Land behind the White Hart PH, Nayland Road: approx. 6 dwellings.
MERSEA ISLAND	16	<p>General Comments – development on Mersea Island</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing numbers too high for Mersea Island; Need to check population figures for Mersea – caravan parks are being used year round as permanent residences; Primary School and Early Years facilities would need expansion; Inadequate infrastructure and facilities to cope with further developments – problems compounded in summer due to influx of tourists; <p>Only one road off the island, regular flooding and poses evacuation risk in event of an accident at Bradwell Nuclear Power Station</p> <p>Dawes Lane</p>
East Mersea	2	
West Mersea	24	
Policy SS17a: Mersea Housing and Employment	534 Plus a petition with 143 signatures	

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood risk – significant part of the site is subject to surface water flooding; Inadequate access. <p>Brierley Paddocks, East Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private access – access to site questioned; Impact on Listed Building (Brierley Hall); Additional information provided by site promoter to support site. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> East Road: 48 dwellings (site previously assessed MER24).
Coast Road	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Agency support the presumption against residential development; Projects within Coast Road should be screened under the Habitat Regulations; Proposed new housing in Mersea will generate additional traffic in this area; Mersea Waterfront should be strengthened further to avoid change of use to residential; The environmental impact of motorised leisure equipment needs to be looked into as it could cause damage by dredging up the seabed and wave impact on The Strood Road; Object to new housing in Mersea.
Policy SS17b: Coast Road	24	
Caravan Parks	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caravan parks add to the pressure of the infrastructure without contributing financially; Caravan parks should build a stronger rapport with the island; Reference should be made to flood warning and evacuation arrangements;
Policy SS17c: Caravan Parks	15	

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many caravans are the main home of the occupiers; • Direct and indirect impacts to designated nature conservation sites need to be assessed; • Congestion will increase, particularly during the summer; • Sustainable travel to caravan sites is very unlikely as no buses pass most of the sites and there is no room to build bikes lanes.
WIVENHOE		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoters of two of the allocated sites support allocations; • Clarification sought regarding the neighbourhood plan's requirement of a cemetery at Elmstead Road; • Environment Agency request involvement in the neighbourhood plan owing to flood risk issues; • Heritage assets must be considered; • Direct & indirect impacts to nature conservation sites need to be assessed; • Green infrastructure provision is essential; • Likely that one of the schools would need to be expanded by half a form and existing early years facilities would either need to be expanded or a new facility developed; • The hospital is unfit for purpose, the GP surgery is stretched & the dentist is closed to NHS patients; • Local infrastructure cannot cope with this number of homes.
Policy SS18: Wivenhoe	12	
Policy OV1: Development in Other Villages and Countryside	19	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Villages 	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy should be reworded so as not to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements; • Historic England welcome the commitment to high quality design; • A criteria regarding SuDS should be added; • Policy appears to support infill developments, which could lead to coalescence between villages;

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any development of small villages should be restricted to an absolute minimum. <p>Alternative sites promoted via representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nursery Site, Smyths Green, Layer Marney: approx. 12 dwellings; Grassreasons Poultry Farm, Newbridge Road, Layer Marney: approx. 6 dwellings; St Ives Road, Peldon: approx. 43 dwellings; Land adjacent Kingsland Villa, Abberton Road, Fingringhoe: 3 dwellings; Land adjacent Forge Cottage, Fingringhoe: approx. 15 dwellings; Picketts Farm, Church Road, Fingringhoe: 10-80 dwellings (6.97ha); Maldon Road, Great Wigborough: CUFC Football Training Academy 17.11ha (linked to Florence Park site, Tiptree); Little Baddocks Farm, Easthorpe Road, Easthorpe: 102 dwellings; Land south of Easthorpe Road, Easthorpe: 165 dwellings; Red House, Messing: approx. 3-9 dwellings; Birch Business Centre, Maldon Road; White Lodge Road, Layer Marney (Local Employment Area expansion). Development should be considered for Little Tey; The sustainability of the other villages is being reduced by the draft policy; There is little opportunity for development to come forward within settlement boundaries; Peldon should be listed as a sustainable village; The settlement boundary for Layer Marney should be expanded to include two brownfield sites; Small scale development should be possible in the future.

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.

LOCATION / PLACE POLICY	Total Reps	Key Issues raised in Representations
Countryside	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The housing needs survey for Layer Marney found that 73% of respondents support a small scale open market housing development; • The interpretation of settlement boundaries needs further thought; • It would be reasonable to treat small gaps between houses in small hamlets as infill. • Village identities should not be eroded by removal of settlement boundaries. • The settlement boundary of Peldon should not be removed.
Alternative options considered	2	

* Total figure includes representations to policy and supporting paragraph.