



Local Plan Committee

Item

7

8 June 2015

Report of	Head of Commercial Services	Author	Laura Chase ☎ 282473
Title	Consultation on the Colchester Borough Local Plan Issues and Options Document		
Wards affected	All		

The Local Plan Committee is asked to consider the responses received following the consultation on the Issues and Options stage of the Local Plan.

1. Decision(s) Required

- 1.1 To note the responses received following a statutory six week public consultation concerning the initial Issues and Options phase of developing a new Local Plan for Colchester.
- 1.2 To note the next steps in plan development set out in section 5 below.

2. Reasons for Decision(s)

- 2.1 To ensure the Council's planning policies are updated in order to provide a robust basis for guiding future growth and development across the Borough.

3. Alternative Options

- 3.1 No alternative options are proposed, as members need to be aware of the issues arising from the statutory consultation process and how Council plans to respond to them as it carries forward development of a new Local Plan. The alternative of not proceeding with a new Local Plan would leave the Council in a vulnerable position going forward with no clear steer for the future growth and development of the Borough. It would result in existing policy becoming outdated and not in accordance with national policy requirements.

4. Supporting Information

- 4.1 At its meeting of 16 December 2014, the Local Plan Committee agreed the publication of an Issues and Options consultation document. The production of an Issues and Options document as a first stage in the development of a new Local Plan reflected national plan-making guidance as stated in Section 18 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. This provides that a local planning authority must invite consultees to 'make representations to the local planning authority about what a local plan...ought to contain', and that the local authority should then take account of these views when developing its plan.

- 4.2 The Issues and Options document provided background on the plan-making process and posed a series of 32 open-ended questions on key issues and 3 main high level options for growth to 2032:
- Options 1A and 1B – sustainable new settlements to both the east and west of Colchester, crossing adjacent borders. Option A would not allow for a proportion of growth of Borough villages; option B would.
 - Options 2A and 2B – sustainable new settlement in the west of Colchester only, crossing the border with Braintree. Option A would not allow for a proportion of growth of Borough villages; option B would.
 - Options 3A and 3B sustainable new settlement to the east of town and an extension to the town, north of the A12. Option A would not allow for a proportion of growth of Borough villages; option B would.
- 4.3 Consultation on the Issues and Options document was carried out from 16 January to 27 February 2015. At the same time, landowners and developers were invited to put forward potential development sites. The results of this Call for Sites process are reported as a separate agenda item to this Committee. The consultation process involved publishing the document and supporting information on the website; notification of the consultation to the Council's extensive list of interested organisations and individuals; and a series of nine public drop-in sessions which were advertised through social media, press coverage, and posters circulated to parish councils. At the drop-in sessions, attendees were provided with background information on the Local Plan process; copies of the consultation document; opportunities to ask questions of the officers in attendance; the chance to leave initial thoughts on post-it notes; and information on how to respond more formally to the consultation.
- 4.4 An estimated total of 415 people attended the Council workshops which were held in a variety of venues across the Borough as follows:
- Colchester Library 17 January 10am-2pm & 27 January 2pm-6pm (45 attendees)
 - Asda (Turner Rise) 24 January 10am-2pm (39 attendees)
 - Great Horkesley New Village Hall 31 January 10am-2pm (37 attendees)
 - Tiptree Community Centre 7 February 10am-2pm (27 attendees)
 - The Mica Centre (West Mersea) 11 February 4pm-8pm (93 attendees)
 - Wivenhoe Scout and Guide Hall 14 February 10am-2pm (82 attendees)
 - Hythe Community Centre (in conjunction with Hythe Forward) 16 February 12pm-8pm (29 attendees)
 - Marks Tey Parish Hall February 10am-2pm (200 attendees)
- 4.5 A summary of issues recorded on post-it notes at the workshops is included as Appendix 1. The Appendix 1 summary also reflects the key issues raised in conversation with officers at the workshops. Particular concerns included:
- The justification for further housing growth in Colchester given existing problems with congestion and infrastructure capacity (health in particular)
 - Specific concerns about growth options and site allocations near attendees' homes.
 - Diverse views on growth options
 - Objections to development on greenfield land and open countryside, including land north of A12 and expansion outside villages
 - Questions over the extent to which job growth could keep pace with housing growth
 - Recognition of the need for more housing, particular affordable housing and housing for different groups – young, old, families, etc.
 - The need to provide more infrastructure in advance of any further growth, with specific mention of the following facilities:

- Roads
- Public transport, including train and station capacity
- Parking
- Hospitals/Surgeries/Clinics
- Schools
- Cycleways, Bridleways and Footpaths
- Open Space/Sports Facilities
- Improvements needed to Town Centre
- Preservation of Colchester's heritage

4.6 The East Colchester session served a dual function, as it also provided a platform for Hythe Forward to consult on local East Colchester issues. Hythe Forward's board reported as follows after the event: 'The dual consultation format gave a pleasing combination of locally relevant detail (specific to the Hythe) with the broader strategic context of Colchester Borough Council's Local Plan. Local people seemed keen to engage with both and were pleasantly surprised at the partnership working between statutory body and community land trust (CLT). The purpose of the event from Hythe Forward's perspective was simply to present initial ideas that could comprise the basis of adopted planning guidance. There were simple feedback forms available, but the main intention was to gauge the public mood with regard to the CLT's three key priorities and some more specific aspirations. 23 forms were filled in and all indicated that the CLT's priorities were considered appropriate, with 'developing high quality public space' emerging as the biggest public concern.'

4.7 Two Parish Councils, Langham and Layer de la Haye, held their own workshops to consider the Local Plan Issues and Options. Both sessions were very well attended, (100 at Langham and 120 at Layer de la Haye) and this high level of attendance was reflected in the subsequent submission of responses from residents from these areas. (See para 4.24.3 and 4.24.4 below on site specific responses)

4.8 By the close of consultation, the Council had received a total of 649 responses from individuals and organisations. The following overview of consultation responses first highlights representative views on the key themes set forth in the consultation document; then is followed by a summary of views on particular growth options and sites put forward in the Call for Sites and finally includes a section on parish council responses. The overview does not attempt to cover all responses, since more detailed summaries and links to the original 649 representations are contained in Appendix 2. While the overview does not set forth whether the Council agrees or disagrees with respondent views, it does provide information on how the Council will assemble the evidence necessary to reach a clear view on the issues raised. Following a period of evidence base development, sustainability appraisal, and policy development work, the Council will be in a position to set forth clear views on policies and growth options in the Preferred Options document to be brought to the December meeting of this committee for approval and then published for consultation early in 2016.

4.9 Summary of responses to questions in the Issues and Options document on key themes:

4.9.1 Vision

Those commenting on the overall vision tended to accept the need for a well-considered long term approach. Essex County Council, for example, stated that "a robust long-term strategy will provide a reliable basis on which ECC and its partners may plan future service provision and required community infrastructure for which they are responsible". CAUSE, a residents group formed in response to proposals for development in the

Colchester/Braintree border area, accepted that 'a long-term plan that extends beyond political cycles is desirable'.

4.9.2 Comments on the content of the vision tended to highlight the importance of sustainability as a guiding principle, although both the general term 'sustainability' and the more specific planning concept of Garden Cities were viewed as contested terms that could mean different things to different people. Several respondents sought to illustrate their ideas with reference to other places ie Freiburg Germany, or the hypothetical Uttoxeter Garden City proposed in the winning Wolfson Prize entry. The Colchester Natural History Society welcomed the CBC support for garden city principles, although it considered that the Council had breached these principles in the past. Proponents for large settlements (ie Gateway 120 and East Colchester/West Tendring) felt that the vision should identify locations for new centres of growth away from the urban areas that would be sustainable and energy efficient and also contribute to the economic well-being of the Borough. Proponents of development adjacent to villages contended that growth should be more widely dispersed in a proportional manner to make villages more self-sufficient and sustainable.

4.9.3 In terms of further work to inform the vision, in addition to looking to best practice elsewhere the planning consultants for Stane Park considered that a study assessing Colchester's position and function within the regional context should be prepared to inform the vision for the new Local Plan strategy which would provide evidence as to how Colchester can compete effectively against other regional destinations to achieve inward investment and growth over the course of the plan period, and reinforce and strengthen its position as a regional centre.

4.9.4 A number of respondents mentioned the need for joint working on formulating a vision, as part of joint work on the plan as a whole. In particular, other local authorities including Essex County Council and adjacent district councils highlighted the importance of cooperation on strategic issues. Mersea Homes' representation highlighted the need for the vision to address issues of complexity and increasing community involvement and suggested that Colchester should utilise university research to inform the Borough's future vision possibly running a joint exercise or having the University as an active participant in developing the vision.

4.9.5 Initial Council response/next steps:

The existing Spatial Vision in the adopted 2008 Core Strategy is considered to provide a solid basis for the vision for the next Local Plan. Equally, however, changing circumstances and priorities may lead to more fundamental changes to the vision. To redraft the vision, the Council will set up meetings with key members and stakeholders to agree priorities for the new Local Plan vision which can then be incorporated into the Preferred Options documents programmed for public consultation in early 2016. Officers will continue to keep abreast of best practice elsewhere and will use evidence from work such as the Employment Land Needs Assessment to help consider the Borough's regional role and function.

4.10 Housing

4.10.1 Justification for overall housing numbers

While many people accepted the need for housing, a significant percentage questioned the amount of additional housing needed, particularly on greenfield land. Barton Willmore on behalf of Gladman Homes submitted its own Housing Market Assessment questioning the findings of Colchester's work on housing demand and supply. The CPRE considered that the quality of the Borough's countryside for its landscape character, for

its setting for town and villages, for its biodiversity and for its agricultural productivity is sufficient to say that the growth can't be accommodated.

4.10.2 Initial Council response/next steps:

The NPPF requires that Local Plans meet the full, objectively assessed needs for housing. To set a target, the Council needs to ensure that its projections of housing need are based on careful consideration of population, economic and housing trends. The Council is carrying out joint work with Braintree, Chelmsford and Tendring Councils to help it set an Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) number as required by national policy. Initial work carried out by consultants Peter Brett Associates is expected imminently, and their work will form the basis of the OAHN number used to underpin housing allocations in the Local Plan.

4.11 Need for new housing to be supported by adequate infrastructure

The need for infrastructure to support housing growth was a clear and consistent theme running through a majority of responses. Many of the individual responses noted current infrastructure capacity problems and the need to make new development contingent on the up-front delivery of infrastructure across all categories, including transport, education, health, open space, telecommunications and community facilities. Essex County Council responded that the new Local Plan should ensure there are clear policies for the full provision, enhancement and funding of infrastructure arising from planned development and pointed to the mechanisms that could help to achieve this, including planning obligations, the use of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), and the ability to negotiate specific contractual obligations for major strategic sites (where Garden City principles may be adopted).

4.11.1 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council is in the initial stages of developing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will provide information on the infrastructure needs associated with new development and how it will be delivered. The range of infrastructure included in the plan will cover the full extent of facilities expected to be needed, including transport, utilities (including broadband), education, health, open space, and community facilities.

4.12 Need for housing for specific groups

The need for housing for specific segments of the population was raised, including older people (The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone) and gypsies and travellers (the Gypsy Council). Several landowners noted that account will need to be taken not only of overall need for different types of housing but also varying market conditions; individual site characteristics; and the fact that need for particular housing mix will change over time.

4.12.1 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Strategic Housing Market Assessment carried out by consultants for the Council provides information on the demand for specific sizes, tenures and types of housing in the Borough which will inform policies guiding those aspects of housing allocations.

4.13 Development of high quality, well-designed sustainable homes

The promotion of high quality sustainable design was frequently mentioned in individual responses. A number of East Colchester residents noted that more control should be placed on housing developers so that estates have a uniform, attractive appearance. The representation on behalf of Mersea Homes, however, stated that design codes should promote diversity not conformity.

4.13.1 Initial Council response/next steps:

Formulation of policies on housing design and sustainability issues will have regard to government guidance on issues such as viability, sustainable construction and design. Planning policy officers will work with development management colleagues to ensure that proposed policies will result in clear and effective guidance for applicants for planning permission.

4.14 Centres and Employment

4.14.1 Supporting the Town Centre and defining an appropriate role for other commercial areas of the Borough

Respondents on the issue of town centre uses and Colchester's commercial hierarchy recognised the need for the Council to comply with national guidance on this topic and for new policy to be based on an up-to-date evidence base. There were, however, varying views on how this could be achieved. While the planning consultants for Sainsbury's considered that the existing retail hierarchy within the Borough is logical and should remain, agents for Turner Rise and Tollgate interests supported a more nuanced approach to policies on town centre uses which recognise the role and potential of District Centres to accommodate some limited growth whilst the Town Centre remains the primary focus for such activity. The planning consultants for Stane Park considered that capacity for growth in the Town Centre is severely restricted due to a combination of topography, heritage assets and the constraining road network, so the Town Centre should focus on specific sectors and allow other sectoral needs to be appropriately permitted elsewhere in the area. Planning consultants for Culver Square in the Town Centre requested that the council consider specific town centre and district centre policies, in addition to setting out a defined retail hierarchy, to further clarify the vision for the future of these locations. They commented that were the situation to arise that the council were considering identifying sites outside of Colchester town centre, the impact of these sites upon the town centre is considered before allocating such sites in order to safeguard the vitality and viability of Colchester town centre.

4.14.2 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council will commission additional work as required to ensure its evidence base on the supply and demand of town centre uses is up-to-date and provides a reliable basis for developing a spatial hierarchy for town centre functions and activities.

4.15 Providing sufficient jobs to keep pace with housing growth

The planning consultants for Stane Park questioned the need for further land to support the delivery of jobs in Colchester and highlighted the need to have regard to market signals such as take-up rates in considering allocations. ECC stated that the role of the A120 as an economic corridor should be strengthened. ECC also highlighted the important role of education in supporting economic growth, with particular regard to the potential of joint projects with the University of Essex and development of programmes to improve educational attainment.

4.15.1 A high number of individual respondents noted that it would be important to deliver jobs alongside new housing.

4.15.2 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council has completed an Employment Land Needs Assessment (January 2015) which will form the basis for assessing employment site allocations for the Local Plan. The next stage of work is the completion of a Strategic Employment Land Assessment which will be carried out jointly with the Strategic Housing Land Assessment and used to inform the Preferred Options.

4.16 Rural Colchester

4.16.1 Striking an appropriate balance between protecting the character of rural Colchester and meeting the need for more housing and employment

While the predominant view among respondents was that rural areas should be protected from development, many accepted the desirability of limited infill growth to meet local needs. Six parish councils supported a limited review of their settlement boundaries to accommodate growth (see separate section below on parish council responses).

4.16.2 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council is undertaking a Settlement Boundary Review which will inform the Preferred Options document and will be published as part of consultation on the document. The Review will have regard to the particular circumstances of each village in the Borough, including the views of parish councils as expressed in their consultation responses and, where relevant, evolving Neighbourhood Plans.

4.17 Promoting Healthy Communities

4.17.1 Providing access to high quality facilities and open spaces/sports facilities to maintain healthy lifestyles

Many individual respondents highlighted current capacity problems with health facilities, Colchester General Hospital in particular. Links between health and planning were widely recognised, and the provision of open space, sports facilities and walking/cycling links were identified as important elements of sustainability requiring policy support in the Local Plan.

4.17.2 Initial Council response/next steps:

The delivery of health services is a rapidly evolving area, and the Council has initiated liaison with relevant providers (including the Clinical Commissioning Group, NHS England, ECC Public Health) to ensure planning policy reflects the actual delivery mechanisms chosen for health provision. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will include information on a wide range of health and community infrastructure, including hospitals, clinics/surgeries, community facilities, educational facilities, open space, green infrastructure and recreational facilities.

4.18 Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

4.18.1 Ensuring transport infrastructure keeps pace with growth

Highways England (formerly the Highways Agency) welcomed the fact that the plan looks to 2032 and beyond as they recognised that appropriate infrastructure takes a long time to deliver and this needs to be identified early in order that it comes on stream as required. They noted that the Government had made commitments to widening the A12 between Chelmsford and Marks Tey, while the A120 has not been identified for improvement. (Please also see their comments in growth options section below)

4.18.2 ECC supported the emphasis placed on sustainable transport and recommends the inclusion of policy options to implement and deliver a range of measures. As the local highway authority, ECC stated that it will ensure the appropriate and necessary assessments are undertaken as Colchester BC seeks to adopt a preferred spatial option for growth and development. ECC supported the objective to increase the numbers of people walking and cycling and noted that this will need to be embedded as part of new

settlement options (if they are progressed by Colchester BC as part of the preferred spatial strategy) to reduce short journeys made by car and the impact on the local and strategic highway network. A number of specific measures were suggested to help achieve more sustainable travel patterns such as car clubs, public transport vouchers, additional cycle/walking paths, and shuttle bus services. In order to help limit impact on the local public transport networks, ECC recommended that rail and bus providers should be involved in the identification and planning of any new or improved services. The mainline rail service between Norwich and London Liverpool Street (which passes through Colchester) is often at full capacity during peak times, it will therefore be important to identify what potential impact any new development will have on these services and what can be done to limit this. (Please also see their comments in growth options section below)

4.18.3 Transport issues were raised by a high percentage of individual responses, including existing problems with road congestion, rail capacity, bus capacity, and non-motorised routes. As with infrastructure in general, many respondents considered that new transport links should be provided in advance of any new development. Some respondents noted the need to improve facilities for the full range of non-motorised transport types (walking, cycling, horse riding) and the associated health, biodiversity and environmental benefits this could bring. In particular, the potential of an orbital green route around Colchester was raised by the Colchester Natural History Society.

4.18.4 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council is working closely with ECC and Highways England to carry out modelling and analysis of current and projected transport demand for all modes across the Borough, with particular regard to the transport implications of developing large new settlements. This work will be fed into the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan explaining the requirements and the delivery/funding arrangements for required infrastructure. Although no formal responses to the Issues and Options consultation were received from Network Rail or the train operator Abellio, the Council is actively engaged meeting with both bodies to develop an agreed approach to future rail development affecting the Borough.

4.19 Heritage and Townscape

4.19.1 Preserving and enhancing the town's rich heritage

English Heritage commented that the Local Plan will be an important factor in conserving and enhancing its rich historic environment. They recommended that the Council carry out a full analysis of existing and potential historic environment evidence base sources. While largely supportive of the issues raised in the Heritage section, English Heritage considered that the consultation document missed out some issues and referred to their guidance document on Local Plans for best practice on a holistic approach to planning for the historic environment and particular issues such as assets on the Heritage at Risk Register, and Conservation Areas.

4.19.2 The ECC response stated that greater priority needed to be given in the plan to the borough's rich but finite archaeological resource, which has come under considerable pressure from development during the period of the current Local Plan, and which is more likely to be overlooked than the built heritage, when considering enhancement opportunities through high quality design. Innovative interpretive approaches to telling the story of the borough is one way in which enhancements can be secured, but this should be guided by a coordinated interpretive masterplan to ensure quality and consistency. Existing and updated Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans for

Conservation Areas within the Borough should be included as evidence base documents for the new Local Plan.

4.19.3 A number of individual responses highlighted the importance of preserving and enhancing Colchester's heritage.

4.19.4 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council has reviewed the existing evidence base on the historic environment issues used to inform current adopted policies and will update as needed to ensure that information is up to date, including evidence on the Historic Environment Record and archaeological data.

4.20 Natural Environment

4.20.1 Ensuring the protection and improvement of countryside, green spaces and corridors

Natural England supported references to the requirements for green infrastructure, biodiversity, and habitat protection within the Issues and Options document and encouraged more explicit attention to these issues as policies are developed. The Environment Agency also highlighted these issues and additionally referred to the importance of Blue Infrastructure as well as Green Infrastructure; the need to address requirements for flood risk assessment and sustainable water management systems.

4.20.2 The Essex Wildlife Trust recommended that the 2008 Local Wildlife Site Review be updated given that site conditions can change relatively quickly. They also stated that the Local Plan should address how green corridors and biodiversity can be robustly defended and enhanced, supported with evidence based on biological records and surveys.

4.20.3 A high percentage of individual responses stressed the importance of protecting open countryside and preserving wildlife habitats.

4.20.4 Initial Council response/next steps:

The Council has reviewed the existing evidence base on natural environment issues used to inform current adopted policies and will update as needed to ensure that information is up to date, including evidence on landscape and townscape character; flooding; Local Wildlife Sites; and water supply. In particular, detailed work will be carried out for proposed large settlements.

4.21 Growth Options and comments on particular sites

4.21.1 General points on growth options

A number of individual responses queried the need for large scale development in the first instance and considered brownfield sites within Colchester would be able to play a greater role in meeting housing need. The CPRE questioned all the growth options given their impact on the countryside and good quality agricultural land, but would not be opposed to sensible development in villages to meet local needs. Numerically, the responses were dominated by views on particular sites put forward for development. Many members of the public were concerned about the implications of development near them on their quality of life, and assumed that additional growth would by definition result in problems such as increased congestion; infrastructure capacity problems; harm to the countryside; and poor quality development. Those who accepted in principle the need for further development to address the need for more homes and jobs frequently considered that the need should be met in a different part of the Borough.

4.21.2 Landowner/developer views on the vision correlated closely with the development they were proposing – ie those proposing development adjacent to villages supported proportionate growth, while those advocating large settlements supported the option including their proposal. Developers of smaller schemes suggested that their sites could make a contribution to housing delivery in the earlier part of the plan period in advance of the slower delivery of large settlements.

4.21.3 Views of adjacent local authorities and Essex County Council on growth options highlighted their willingness to work with Colchester to agree and refine a strategic approach. Option 1 (either A or B) was supported in principle by Tendring District Council. Essex County Council and Braintree at this stage did not express a view on options but did state their willingness to work with Colchester on a joint approach to strategic development. Maldon DC expressed a preference for Option 1B which was considered to be likely to result in a lower volume of land release needed in the rural areas, and in particular around the settlements of West Mersea and Tiptree to the south of the borough, which are close to the border with Maldon.

4.21.4 Option 1 – Development to the East and West

Highways England noted that Options 1a, 1b and Options 2a, 2b are likely to result in significant impacts on both the A12 and A120 which are already running close to capacity. They considered that modelling work, yet to be undertaken will confirm that upgrading of the A12 and A120 will be required. Their view was that it may be better to focus growth to be delivered in the early part of the planning period to the east of Colchester until the situation regarding the future improvement of the A120 becomes clearer. Significant growth around Marks Tey may only be possible with appropriate mitigation measure funded through development.

4.21.5 The Environment Agency considered that in terms of flood risk, options 1a, 1b or 2a and 2b would probably be preferable. Surface water from options 3a and 3b (in north Colchester) would have to drain through existing urbanised areas to discharge to the River Colne and would potentially increase the vulnerability of adjacent areas to surface water flooding or flooding from minor watercourses that receive the flows from the development. Development to the west could discharge to the Roman River, while the area to the east of Colchester would drain to tidal waters via Salary Brook.

4.21.6 Anglian Water noted that all options for growth would result in a substantial requirement for new foul sewerage infrastructure and water treatment works, and they would expect to work with developers to address these requirements.

(Please see Option 2 below for comments exclusively on developments to the west, and Option 3 for comments on developments to the east)

4.22 Option 2 – Development to the West

82 respondents objected to large scale development in West Tey. The main concerns expressed included the current lack of infrastructure in the area; the need for infrastructure to be provided up-front in advance of any development; the impact on the character of surrounding villages; the loss of countryside and open space.

4.22.1 The Colchester Natural History Society consider Option 2 to be the 'least worst' option. Currently, all options include development in and at the edges of the current urban area, which runs counter to the Garden City concept of expanding green areas.

4.22.2 ECC as Highway Authority would seek a new A120 between Braintree and Marks Tey as part of any new settlement to the west of Colchester. They thought that this settlement could also require provision of a new railway station on the mainline.

4.22.3 Persimmon Homes stated that the Council could not be reliant on delivery from this site in the early part of the plan period and should therefore consider phasing of current identified allocations, alongside less infrastructure hungry schemes in the first five years of the plan.

4.23 Option 3 – Development to the East and North

22 respondents commenting on proposals for East Colchester/West Tendring were largely of the view that Options 2A and B are most appropriate because East is already well-developed and has well-used and important green open spaces nearby. Too much new development directly on the eastern border was considered to create an unpleasant and unmanageable urban sprawl which would harm character and appearance of rural area. If there is to be new development to the east, respondents from the East Colchester area considered that there should be a buffer of green land of 1.5km around Salary Brook.

4.23.1 The Colchester Natural History Society highlighted the potential for a green walking/cycling orbital route around Colchester which could include the Salary Brook Valley. A commitment to simply preserving a route was considered insufficient – the route needs to be set within a sufficiently wide area and serve as a connection between places of value and utility.

4.23.2 Essex Wildlife Trust objects to development on land to the east of Colchester as it considers it would have serious adverse impacts on an important strategic wildlife corridor including Salary Brook Local nature Reserve.

4.23.3 ECC stated that given the levels of congestion in Colchester, particularly east Colchester, ECC as Highways Authority would only be able to support a new settlement to the east of Colchester with a new link road between the A133 and A120, and a new junction on the A120. Proposals for growth to the north of the A12 will need to be informed by modelling to establish impacts. Junction 28 on the A12 was not designed/constructed to be loaded with development traffic arising from growth north of this location; a key issue to consider when assessing this option.

4.24 Comments related to sites put forward in the Call for Sites

4.24.1 Irvine Road Orchard

The largest number of responses to the consultation were received on a proposal for residential development of the Irvine Road orchard (289 responses.) The majority of responses took the form of an e-mail stating that allocation would be ‘completely against the council’s own policy on protecting urban open space, and its allocation in the previous LDF.’ Other respondents noted the importance of the site as an orchard; wildlife site; and open space in an urban area.

4.24.2 Battleswick Farm, Rowhedge

34 respondents objected to development of land at Battleswick Farm in Rowhedge, raising concerns about development resulting in coalescence of Rowhedge with the urban area of Colchester; the loss of open space/greenfield land; lack of infrastructure capacity and transport access in Rowhedge; loss of village character which is already being affected by development at Rowhedge Wharf; and impact on amenity and wildlife.

4.24.3 Layer de la Haye

32 respondents objected to the cumulative effect that residential development proposals could have on Layer de la Haye, noting concerns about constrained road access to the village; school and health capacity; the negative effect on village character; loss of countryside and wildlife habitats; and coalescence with Colchester. Some respondents noted that the need for further development could be better met elsewhere at larger strategic sites.

4.24.4 Boxted/Langham

22 respondents raised concerns about proposals to development in the Boxted/Langham area, noting concerns about current infrastructure constraints; impact on the character of villages; loss of countryside/green space/wildlife habitats. Many Boxted respondents noted that the residents of Boxted had recently been canvassed for their views in relation to their Neighbourhood Plan and that there had been overwhelming support (94%) for the maintenance of a clear green boundary between Boxted and Colchester to maintain the village identity of Boxted. Responses to the Issues and Options consultation did not address the proposal for a Garden Suburb in Langham because unlike the other Garden City/Suburb options to the east and west of Colchester, the Garden Suburb proposal for Langham was submitted through the concurrent Call for Sites process and was not included as a potential option in the Council's Issues and Options document.

4.25 Response from Parish Councils

- 4.26 24 Parish Councils in Colchester Borough responded to the Issues and Options consultation. Kelvedon Parish Council also responded from Braintree District. There was a varied response from the parish councils in terms of the level of support or opposition to the 6 growth options set out in the Issues and Options consultation document. 4 Parish Councils did not identify a preferred option where they could support growth. 8 Parish Councils expressed varying degrees of support for Options 1A, 2A or 3A which promoted urban extensions with 2 proposed new settlements to the west and east of Colchester and growth to the north of the A12. Myland Community Council and Little Horkeley Parish Council, support for option 2A was conditional on new or improved infrastructure being delivered as part of any future growth. Stanway Parish Council was generally opposed to any significant new levels of growth, but, felt that if growth had to proceed, then the garden city approach was the most sustainable approach to adopt. Hence they supported option 1A over the other proposed options. Eight Ash Green Parish Council was generally more supportive of the A options, as they felt that directing growth to existing or new urban areas was more sustainable than expanding rural villages. Aldham Parish Council and Wivenhoe Town Council identified growth option 3A as their preferred option because there was more land to develop north of Colchester and because these areas had better suitable infrastructure to support new growth. Layer de la Haye Parish Council was most supportive of Options 1A and 2A where additional housing settlement areas could be developed in existing settlements which already had space to expand and where appropriate infrastructure either already exists or could be provided. Messing cum Inworth Parish Council only expressed support for option 1A as they felt that rural villages and their character and open spaces/biodiversity needed to be protected.
- 4.27 There was also varied support for the B options which included the same growth area as proposed in the A options but with additional growth in rural settlements. 6 parish councils supported at least one of the B options (Wivenhoe, Little Horkeley, Myland, Marks Tey, West Bergholt and Tiptree Parish Council). Tiptree Parish Council supported option 1B as they felt rural areas needed additional growth to prevent them from

stagnating. Wivenhoe Town Council supported options 1B & 3B because they felt that there was more development land available north of the A12 while West Bergholt Parish Council felt that there was scope for limited (10%) expansion to settlement boundaries as well as urban expansions and new settlements. Little Horkesley Parish Council and Myland Community Council expressed support for option 2B, however their support was conditional on infrastructure upgrades or new facilities being delivered. Layer Marney PC had concerns about options 2A & 2B, namely, because of the number of potential development sites that had been put forward for development through the Call For Sites processes. There was no support for expanding the settlement boundary in Layer de la Haye or increasing the size of the village significantly. They were also opposed to the expansion of Colchester Town which the parish council did not feel was realistic given existing congestion and shortage of infrastructure in the Town.

- 4.28 Wivenhoe and West Mersea Town Councils and Winstred Hundred Parish Council were opposed to any growth in their areas because they felt that there was no suitable development land left, other areas had more development potential, existing infrastructure was at capacity making further growth unsustainable or that the area was unsuitable for growth without impacting on rural character. Marks Tey Parish Council was most opposed to the 1A & 1B and 2A & 2B options which they felt were over reliant on excessive growth to the west of Colchester. They felt that growth needed to be more fairly distributed across all development areas including rural areas. They also identified the need for an alternative growth option to the west of Colchester focused around the A12 to be explored that promoted lower housing numbers than those proposed in the Issues and Options consultation paper. Wivenhoe Town Council felt that the option of no further growth was missing from the consultation paper.
- 4.29 Little Horkesley was not convinced that the areas proposed for growth under options 1A & 1B could sustain the level of development being proposed. They were also strongly opposed to options 3A & 3B due the impact on the open countryside in north Colchester and the Dedham Vale AONB. Copford/Easthorpe and Great Tey Parish Councils objected strongly to options 2A & 2B due their potential impact on the rural areas/character and on traffic and local facilities. Boxted Parish Council was also strongly opposed to the inclusion of options 3A & 3B on the grounds that development in these areas would result in creeping development between Boxted and Colchester and Dedham Vale AONB and adversely impact on the surrounding countryside character and landscape. Boxted requested the removal of these options.
- 4.30 Many of the parish councils recognised the need for small amounts of modest growth to deliver smaller houses and affordable units particularly for young families and older people. 6 parish councils expressed support for either reviewing existing settlement boundaries to help meet the above identified local housing needs or requested a meeting with the Council to discuss future housing needs and potential sites to accommodate it. These were Chappel, West Bergholt, Copford/Easthorpe, East Donyland, Layer Marney, and Great Tey parish councils.
- 4.31 7 of the parish councils who responded to the Issues and Options consultation are currently preparing Neighbourhood plans. 6 of these neighbourhood plans are expected to identify sites for growth including Boxted, Eight Ash Green, West Bergholt, Wivenhoe, and Tiptree) and). Myland and Stanway Neighbourhood Plans are not expected to deliver new housing growth through their Neighbourhood Plans. Copford/Easthorpe, Fordham and Great Tey Parish Councils are also considering preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.
- 4.32 The Council will continue to work closely with parish councils to agree whether decisions on growth for their villages should be made through the Local Plan or by a Neighbourhood Plan. Parish council views on appropriate levels of growth will be included in the Settlement Boundary Review the Council is carrying out to provide the

evidence base, and their views will help define the parameters for the Council's approach to village growth.

4.33 Consultation process

The Council will continue to explore new ways to inform and involve the public in plan development to increase awareness and response rates. Parish Councils are playing an increasingly important role in spreading the word about Local Plan issues and have been helpful in displaying information, encouraging responses to the consultation, and, in the case of Langham and Layer-de-la-Haye, holding consultation workshops. Some residents living in areas such as Langham and Rowhedge where development proposals were submitted in the Call for Sites exercise held at the same time as the Issues and Options consultation felt that they did not have adequate time to respond to the submissions within the consultation timeframe. They will, however, have an opportunity to comment at the Preferred Options stage on any sites that survive the rigorous filtering process of sites to ensure they meet sustainability criteria and policy objectives.

5. **Proposals**

5.1 The following section of the report sets out the next stages of plan development leading to the examination and adoption of a new Local Plan by 2017.

5.2 Development of a draft plan involves the consolidation of several strands of work as follows:

- Agreement on the plan's vision and objectives.
Member and stakeholder views will be sought to inform development of the plan's vision and objectives. In particular, it will be important for the vision and objectives to align with the Council's Strategic Plan.
- Development of realistic housing and employment targets for the provision of a 15 year development land supply. This process will be informed as noted above, by consultant work commissioned jointly with adjacent authorities.
- Sustainability Appraisal and evaluation of potential development sites. The Council is completing a Sustainability Appraisal of potential policies and allocations. The Scoping Report for the first Issues and Options stage of this process established a range of sustainability objectives. All options for potential policies and site allocations are assessed against these objectives to compare their environmental, economic and social effects and ultimately to assess how sustainable an option is.
- Preparation of a Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment. This work to be carried out by the Council will establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.
- Completion of a range of evidence base work needed to inform policies and allocations. Officers are carrying out a programme of producing and updating evidence work, drawing on both internal and external resources.
- Development of draft spatial strategy and associated policies and site allocations, ensuring that they address issues raised in the Issues and Options consultation. Policies and allocations will need to align with national policy; as well as the evolving overall spatial strategy and the local evidence base.

5.3 All of the above strands of work will be drawn together in a draft plan to provide a consistent, coherent and well-informed strategy to guide future growth in the Borough to 2032. This Preferred Options document is programmed to be submitted to the 14th December Local Plan Committee for approval in advance of public consultation on the document in early 2016.

6. Strategic Plan References

- 6.1 The Strategic Plan Action Plan includes a commitment to regenerating the borough through buildings, employment, leisure and infrastructure. There are also commitments to attract investment and provide more affordable homes. The development of a new Local Plan is closely linked to these objectives.

7. Consultation

- 7.1 Public consultation took place in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

8. Publicity Considerations

- 8.1 There is likely to be continued interest as the Local Plan progresses resulting in publicity for the Council.

9. Financial Implications

- 9.1 A budget has been allocated for Local Plan development which funds the updating of evidence based documents, consultation and examination.

10. Equality, Diversity and Human Rights implications

- 10.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been prepared for the Local Development Framework and is available to view on the Colchester Borough Council website by following this pathway from the homepage: Council and Democracy > Policies, Strategies and Performance > Diversity and Equality > Equality Impact Assessments > Strategic Policy and Regeneration > Development Plan.

- 10.2 There are no particular Human Rights implications.

11. Community Safety Implications

- 11.1 None

12. Health and Safety Implications

- 12.1 None

13. Risk Management Implications

- 13.1 Review of the Local Plan will reduce the risk of inappropriate development being permitted.

14. Disclaimer

- 14.1 The information in this report was, as far as is known, correct at the date of publication. Colchester Borough Council cannot accept responsibility for any error or omission.

Appendix 1

Issue & Options Consultation Events – Post it notes

Local Plan Themes - Housing
If this new town is proposed it must have its own Council, schools, High Street shopping, Town Hall, Hospital/Health Care Centres, Parking, Parks/Public gardens & Community Halls with space for Culture. 15000 homes does not leave room for any of this. X5
Please restrict buildings in Villages to the numbers required by that community. DO NOT allow wholesale development so that our village lose the structure and character and arable land & woods etc.
Clear policy of planning gain with housing for Employment with new settlements for sustainability & travel reduction. Also provide Retail
Mersea island has not got good road links to railways. The Doctors surgery is already crowded our roads always have potholes and our school is already one of the largest. We need facilities to be improved before further homes can be built
A new development West of Colchester has to be Option 2B, Building north of Colchester will send traffic in to already congested North Station so NO to 3A. No to building east of Colchester 1B. Tendring will give up land but Colchester will get all the traffic congestion
Building houses from the Firs Road is an Outrage!
NO to 1A, 1B, 2A & 2B – YES to 3A & 3B
No to more houses, Where are these people supposed to come from!
Keep A12 as a boundary for North Colchester will maintain the rural nature of the villages. This will DESTROY Colchester if you merge them.
Don't build beyond A12 leave a gap between A12 & Babergh
Unite the Severalls are and land adjacent to Cants as is has been established.
Rent Control – Affordable to be actually affordable! X2
Make use of empty properties
Many older people wait to move from their large homes to free up for younger families. Encourage the building of larger retirement homes for people to downsize rather than building retirement apartment/flat with 1 or 2 bedrooms.
It is important to maintain small villages rather than extending them to Urban sprawl. Marks Tey is already split by the A12.
Great Tey & Little Tey should maintain small village identity tighter Rental control X2
Create a new bypass A120 to link Stanway. No development South of Marks Tey in Green Belt x3
Good Idea. Plenty of 2 bed starter homes please in West Mersea
Stop allowing people to acquire & demolish rural affordable housing and replace it with enormous mansions x2
Replace Caravans with Houses
Houses should be built in uniform styles of high design and not a mish mash of developments
Allowing so much development around Marks Tey/Little Tey would turn a lovely country village into a town and make a sprawl from Colchester to Braintree
If new houses are built adequate parking must be included off road X2
More Affordable housing for the young. 20% maximum
Where does this influx of population come from and how will it be sustained.

Time to review the Green Belt Policy. Scope for development on Brownfield sites
New houses should be in proportion to the size of the village
Any settlement expansion should be for the benefit of local community
New builds should look like existing buildings with more outside space
New houses should have Solar panels as standard
Single occupancies studio flats for 18-25 age group
Southern Bypass
Sustainable communities sound right
Do not sprawl to the north it is too remote and not near railway
No More major housing until the Infrastructure has caught up with the population growth
I have seen other areas destroyed by constant building of development. What about infrastructure. Mersea is an island of interest, beauty and community. DO NOT DESTROY THIS! X2
Please do not create a half-way house.
Lived on Mersea island for 13 years and feel no more houses should be built x2
Before giving planning permission for any planning, Suggest that the planners visit areas personally at different times of the day instead of just looking at a map.
Keep Marks Tey as a village don't spoil it with thousands of houses
Allocated land for Travellers Pitches.
Could do with some affordable smaller houses for older people to downsize x2
What about Care homes for the elderly
We need suitable and affordable housing for young people in Wivenhoe
Low cost housing is essential do not build for rich London commuters
We don't need another development like Well House a building disaster, always floods and an eye sore!

Local Plan Themes – Centres and Employment
Hospital & School can't cope now!
Review the supply chain of CBC. Keep money local
People of Colchester need to feel proud of our town but the town centre is shameful! Quite a lot of it is due to the lack of relationship between ECC & CBC
Housing growth must be balanced with appropriate employment opportunities. Houses are easy to build but jobs are not!
High quality needed. Minimum wage zero hours contract not helping young people.
Increased development to the proposed scale will not bring long term employment to the area
Unrealistic to assume that the over development of Colchester will bring employment. What % will be for people outside Colchester or even from Europe
More support for Social Enterprises
Maybe too late for Colchester now. All the individual shops are gone
Colchester in the evening should be avoided as it is not a safe environment. Behaviour in the TC needs to be addressed
Allow locals to have an active role. Some Councillors decided on Colchester and they are wrong. More local views sought.
All businesses and leisure is dependent on transport. Villages should not be considered as industrial opportunities
Slow down out of town retail growth

Colchester will become a ghost town if out of town development continues – Look at Harwich!

Mersea needs a larger medical centre and school x5

Don't build a secondary School on Mersea Island

Local Plan Themes – Rural Colchester

Option B is a worry for villages

No HGV's on Rural roads

Colchester and Horkesley are very nice places to live. Let's not be too negative. We need housing and infrastructure

Both Copford & Easthorpe have their own distinct communities – these will be lost if Option 2B or 1B goes ahead

Some rural housing is desirable preferably affordable housing sited along existing roads and incorporating small gardens

Remember that Essex has some wonderful villages Don't spoil them by a new town

Private development – the villages are usually huge builds pricing locals out of the area, also too many smaller existing houses or bungalows are allowed to be extended in to mansion with the same effect

More smaller affordable homes for the rural villages x2

Great Tey is a thriving community. Allowing lots of new houses will spoil the villages, and why is infill being turned down if the village badly needs new homes>

LEAVE Marks Tey Alone it has suffered enough x2

Wivenhoe needs to keep its green space

Keep Green Belt between Colchester & Tendring

Ensure that new developments encourage inhabitants to use local facilities and not gravitate towards Colchester's resources

Leave Little Tey alone! X2

Encourage mixed use so that business/residents in rural village

If I wanted to live in a town I would have done so. Leave the Villages alone!

Need arable land to provide food for local people, therefore planning build needs to be proportionate

Local Plan Themes – Health/Other Infrastructure

People must take on more responsibility for their own health (good basic diet/exercise etc.) and not expect NHS to pick up the pieces. It's not difficult

Create a network of Bridleways around Colchester to connect up

Colchester Hospital – Enough Said!

With expansion we will need another Doctors and Dentist

NHS under serious strain (places in special measures) How will the trust cope with major expansion

Expanded hospital or more local walk in centres – 24hours

Hospital facilities need to be expanded as they are already struggling with the current population X6

We need direct buses to hospital and to leisure World

While Wivenhoe new surgery is welcome, it will clearly not be enough. We need to keep the current surgery open as a satellite to take up the slack and provide services

for upper Wivenhoe x2
Colchester Hospital is already deemed inadequate by CQC. How will it cope with more people when they are having budget cuts?
More Hospital & medical facilities essential x8
More sports facilities around the stadium including athletics facilities usually forgotten. Also more country side available for walking and running such as Highwood's Country Park which is a huge asset
New schools would be required
Development of West Mersea would be catastrophic for the very stretched facilities i.e. Doctors, Dentist
Keep Villages Distinct
What about the poor Doctors – Overworked already
Make/Create/Adopt a policy that allows/ensures all cycle paths are also used for Bridle paths
Bigger hospitals more capacity
More houses need more school, health centres and hospitals. More and better drainage to decrease flooding on pavement and roads
All for increasing sports facilities/playing fields but please ensure adequate parking with access off A12 only – NOT Langham Road for safety
Public open space especially an area of parkland alongside Clinghoe Hill is essential
Protecting areas of natural beauty and open space is essential once built on it will be gone forever
Hospitals can't cope now.
Keep Wivenhoe as 1 separate town using green wedge, Country park and green cemetery
What about a 3-4 storey car park at the hospital like the one at the University
If landfill site is opened or built upon – serious risk to health
Protect green space, more allotments & community gardens
Use imagination for sites. Allow locals to have a say in how design
Provide a site for youth club and open space.
Open space such as a Highwoods Country Park is very important for physical & mental health. Continue rise of more and more concrete & brick is very depressing
Need to keep a green wedge between the University and Wivenhoe – Otherwise the village/town will disappear into larger Colchester

Local Plan Themes – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility
Any development needs to link up using the railway and walking. Cycle paths to keep some of the cars off the road for many commuters x2
Need more road crossings across the rail line
North South movement across Colchester is not good enough
Marks Tey needs to have the A120 re-routed if any more houses are to be added
Slip road A134 on to A12
Slip road from Bergholt on to A12
Link houses to railway stations – cycle lanes would be best not cars
A120 is already inadequate for current traffic. Why build more houses there when the road is always busy
Most new employment for Colchester residents will be in London but the trains are

inadequate even now and need addressing
CBC needs to sort out roads and traffic in the TC. Improving roads is a priority.
A120 & Railway station development is needed to meet new town X2
A12/A120 cannot cope with the traffic already! More people and we won't be going anywhere? Lost jobs/stress/unemployment
You must By-Pass A120 to A12 x2
Dedicated cycle route from Mersea to Colchester not just cycle lanes x2
Cannot have new development without significant improvements in roads and associated infrastructure
A120 is gridlocked. Impossible to leave Great Tey Village now. NO plans to upgrade is crazy
Plans say nothing about Infrastructure – road, rail, hospital & schools x2
A12 & A120 cannot cope with traffic as is. Government needs to bring the Railways back in public control and make public transport more affordable, this would reduce traffic
Serious concerns about capacity of trains to London which are always very busy
Link Road to A120 before Clingoe Hill
Railways connection, improve the trains and place smaller developments near railway stations
Need to shift to eco-buses. Electric charging points
Proper bus station with facilities x2
Why is the P & R not stopping at the hospital? X2
Marks Tey train station is already at capacity. 15000 more homes ARE YOU INSANE?
Better bus services from Mersea to Maldon
Direct bus from Wivenhoe to hospital x2
Footbridge over Colne from Rowhedge to Wivenhoe
Public transport is on the decline
Greater use of P & R need routes north to south and east to west
Can't park at Marks Tey station after 9am? Where are you going to park instead?
Cycle routes must be extended all-round the town Present bus station does not meet the requirement
A120 Braintree to Marks Tey need urgent attention before it becomes a complete standstill x2
I stand up without a seat on a 7am train every morning HOW can you want more houses when the infrastructure is not in place?
You Must not bypass A120 to A12
Need more parking in Wivenhoe – Especially when medical centre opens.
Parking needed near Quay/High Street area
Promote healthy transport – Walking & Cycling
More Bus Lanes
Building a new town along the A120 will bring increased traffic even with A120 development
Marks Tey station is not big enough (parking), bus service is not good enough and no cycle pathways
Need P & R from South side of Colchester
Make the railway station more accessible to?
A decent bus service to Witham is badly needed
Cycle lane/pavement in Boxted & Langham so more could cycle or walk to

destinations safely x3
The narrow access onto/off Mersea need to be sorted out x3
How will everyone get off and on the island as the roads are bad already
There is a need for more inter linking safe off road tracks for walkers, cyclist throughout the district x2
Better bus services x2
Driving is a problem on Mersea
Reduce Noise pollution from A12
Junction upgrade badly needed at Rivenhall/Silver End. Signage is dangerous
Road, Rail & bus infrastructure needs significant improvement
Sort Transport out before development x2
A12 junction upgrade at Feering & Kelvedon
Cycle route to Colchester from West Mersea
More trains to stop at Marks Tey station this will help with the congestion at North Colchester x2
Free bus passes for all children as in London
Development in Tiptree needs to consider transport infrastructure specifically access to the A12 x2
Park & Ride bus to stop at the Hospital
Under pass under the railway station this would ease congestion x2
Joined up public transport – bus/rail/bike x2

Local Plan Themes – Heritage and Townscape
Heritage character very important. New communities need these from the start not just collection of boxes to sleep in
Hythe port needs recognizing as Historic and efforts made to support groups wishing to utilise river & quay – social enterprise
Make sure innovative ideas are not stifled by referencing to “in keeping”
Create better open spaces. Make better use of Hythe Bridge, its fab that skaters use it
Colchester heritage building & etc. must be preserved at all costs.
How are our 6 th form going to cope with the demands made on them while their budgets keep getting tighter
Great for CBC to draw a line under we can’t afford to build affordable. Allow those developers to walk away
If villages are expanded the design of properties should be an enhancement not on everyone.
Colchester’s Borough’s heritage is extensive from pre-Roman times to medieval. This includes many villages & other features – chariot races tracks, roman roads, woollen industry etc. Please preserve it.
We need to keep countryside so easy access from towns. In fill is a good thing but not great new developments on green filled sites.
Agricultural land is growing OUR food. Where will this come from
Concerned rural heritage will be destroyed and concerns with farming producing local produce.
Retailing should be in town centre – only bulky goods in out of town centres
Protect and preserve Heritage
Weight bridge limit on Appleford Bridge

Local Plan Themes – Natural Environment
Need to provide employment opportunities very close to housing to enable as many as possible to live close to where they work
Need to use cycle routes more. Not along the edges of the roads as in Prettygate as cars park on them
Make sure that any large scale development is supported. Mix for plenty of facilities for the young
Expand Severalls Land – keep Industrial = Jobs. Not retail (Car dealer) and Stanway same Industrial
Everyone wants a local green space
The Historic views of the island as you approach West Mersea would be destroyed by more housing
CBC has already reneged on the promise not to build North of the A12. Light and noise pollution blight our rural lines. It is not enough to leave a “green gap” if said gap is so small
The walks and wildlife of West Mersea would be totally destroyed by more housing all areas are surrounded by footpaths
Mersea Island is a part of the evacuation zone for Bradwell. More people living here = more to be evacuated x2
Surely the fields of West Mersea are Greenfield sites
I didn't move to Boxted which is lovely & rural for it to become a suburb of Colchester. We need to maintain a clear green boundary between Boxted & Colchester
Include Bridleways in any new building development X4
Urban sprawl will destroy village life
Green Belt needs to be protected
No further growth of other villages x2
Salary brook needs to be protected. Please no buildings keep green space x2
Why can't you build up not out
Don't touch any woodland. If development goes ahead plant more trees
When building on arable farmland when this is used to grow food x2
Consideration to capacity of sewerage works & services needs to be part of the plan x2
44 acres behind Field Way & Mede Way represents mixed habitat
Protect landscape views, wildlife areas. Link to corridors. Improve access
Protect & Preserve Town heritage
Sustainable energy on new builds needed. Upfront installation of renewable solar panels on all new builds x2
Leave Coastal Protection Belt as it is x4
This development will reduce rural life enormously
Ensure policies protect Green space x3
More Brownfield sites. Save our Green belt areas x2
I don't think developers are interested in the natural environment. You only have to take a ride to North Colchester and see very high density housing to realise that. If we allow any more concreting over there will no natural environment to worry about x2
Country Park for Salary Brook – Need to protect Green Belt x3
Leave villages alone. It is Britain's Heritage to have villages – we don't want a huge urban sprawl joining them all together

Some of the sites are Colchester beautiful areas. Please preserve the rural landscape
The current proposals for 7500 houses to Marks Tey end of Coggeshall Road and the same number for Braintree end is by far too dense a plan. The massive amount of arable land this would take will impact on the food supply. The numbers need adjusting
Good farm land wasted
Air Pollution between A12 and A120 is a concern and will be worse as traffic increases x2
Keep the Green space without this we won't need rural jobs
This is the thin end of the wedge – next thing there will be all main chains and our local community will be ruined forever.
More bridleways so I can ride my horse safely!

Local Plan Themes – Education
Build Autism units & language units within mainstream schools to encourage diversity and integration rather than segregation & isolation x3
Need a new Secondary School if this development goes ahead x3