

# **Local Development Framework Committee**

Grand Jury Room, Town Hall  
23 March 2009 at 6:00pm

**The Local Development Framework Committee  
deals with**  
the Council's responsibilities relating to the Local  
Development Framework.

# Information for Members of the Public

## Access to information and meetings

You have the right to attend all meetings of the Council, its Committees and Cabinet. You also have the right to see the agenda, which is usually published 5 working days before the meeting, and minutes once they are published. Dates of the meetings are available at [www.colchester.gov.uk](http://www.colchester.gov.uk) or from Democratic Services.

## Have Your Say!

The Council values contributions from members of the public. Under the Council's Have Your Say! policy you can ask questions or express a view to meetings, with the exception of Standards Committee meetings. If you wish to speak at a meeting or wish to find out more, please pick up the leaflet called "Have Your Say" at Council offices and at [www.colchester.gov.uk](http://www.colchester.gov.uk).

## Private Sessions

Occasionally meetings will need to discuss issues in private. This can only happen on a limited range of issues, which are set by law. When a committee does so, you will be asked to leave the meeting.

## Mobile phones, pagers, cameras, audio recorders

Please ensure that all mobile phones and pagers are turned off before the meeting begins and note that photography or audio recording is not permitted.

## Access

There is wheelchair access to the Town Hall from West Stockwell Street. There is an induction loop in all the meeting rooms. If you need help with reading or understanding this document please take it to Angel Court Council offices, High Street, Colchester or telephone (01206) 282222 or textphone 18001 followed by the full number that you wish to call, and we will try to provide a reading service, translation or other formats you may need.

## Facilities

Toilets are located on the second floor of the Town Hall, access via the lift. A vending machine selling hot and cold drinks is located on the ground floor.

## Evacuation Procedures

Evacuate the building using the nearest available exit. Make your way to the assembly area in the car park in St Runwald Street behind the Town Hall. Do not re-enter the building until the Town Hall staff advise you that it is safe to do so.

Colchester Borough Council, Angel Court, High Street, Colchester  
telephone (01206) 282222 or  
textphone 18001 followed by the full number that you wish to call  
e-mail: [democratic.services@colchester.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@colchester.gov.uk)  
[www.colchester.gov.uk](http://www.colchester.gov.uk)

**COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL  
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK COMMITTEE  
23 March 2009 at 6:00pm**

**Members**

Chairman : Councillor Cope.  
Deputy Chairman : Councillor Spyvee.  
Councillors Jowers, Davidson, Garnett, Goss, Naish and Sutton.

**Substitute Members** : All members of the Council who are not members of the Planning Committee.

**Agenda - Part A**

(open to the public including the media)

**Pages**

**1. Welcome and Announcements**

(a) The Chairman to welcome members of the public and Councillors and to remind all speakers of the requirement for microphones to be used at all times.

(b) At the Chairman's discretion, to announce information on:

- action in the event of an emergency;
- mobile phones switched to off or to silent;
- location of toilets;
- introduction of members of the meeting.

**2. Substitutions**

Members may arrange for a substitute councillor to attend a meeting on their behalf, subject to prior notice being given. The attendance of substitute councillors must be recorded.

**3. Urgent Items**

To announce any items not on the agenda which the Chairman has agreed to consider because they are urgent and to give reasons for the urgency.

**4. Declarations of Interest**

The Chairman to invite Councillors to declare individually any personal interests they may have in the items on the agenda.

If the personal interest arises because of a Councillor's membership of

or position of control or management on:

- any body to which the Councillor has been appointed or nominated by the Council; or
- another public body

then the interest need only be declared if the Councillor intends to speak on that item.

If a Councillor declares a personal interest they must also consider whether they have a prejudicial interest. If they have a prejudicial interest they must leave the room for that item.

If a Councillor wishes to make representations on an item on which they have a prejudicial interest they may do so if members of the public are allowed to make representations. In such circumstances a Councillor must leave the room immediately once they have finished speaking.

An interest is considered to be prejudicial if a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard it as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the Councillor's judgement of the public interest.

Councillors should consult paragraph 7 of the Meetings General Procedure Rules for further guidance.

## **5. Have Your Say!**

(a) The Chairman to invite members of the public to indicate if they wish to speak or present a petition at this meeting – either on an item on the agenda or on a general matter not on this agenda. You should indicate your wish to speak at this point if your name has not been noted by Council staff.

(b) The Chairman to invite contributions from members of the public who wish to Have Your Say! on a general matter not on this agenda.

## **6. Minutes**

**1 - 9**

To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 2 December 2008.

## **7. Development Policies Development Plan Document // Consultation Results**

**10 - 60**

See report by the Head of Strategic Policy and Regeneration.

## **8. Site Allocations Development Plan Document // Consultation Results**

**61 - 146**

See report by the Head of Strategic Policy and Regeneration.

## **9. Exclusion of the Public**

In accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the public, including the press, from the meeting so that any items containing exempt information (for example confidential personal, financial or legal advice), in Part B of this agenda (printed on yellow paper) can be decided. (Exempt information is defined in Section 100I and Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972).



# LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK COMMITTEE

## 2 DECEMBER 2008

*Present :-* Councillor Nick Cope (Chairman)  
Councillors Christopher Garnett, Martin Goss,  
John Jowers, Kim Naish, Henry Spyvee and  
Terry Sutton

*Substitute Member :-* Councillor Robert Arnold  
for Councillor Robert Davidson

### 10. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2008 were confirmed as a correct record.

**Councillor John Jowers (in respect of his role as an Essex County Council Cabinet member for Localism and Planning and his membership of the East of England Regional Planning Panel) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3)**

### 11. Adoption of the Colchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Strategic Policy and Regeneration together with the binding report of the Planning Inspector following the Independent Examination in June and July this year, and the revised Core Strategy which incorporated all the changes recommended by the Inspector.

The Inspector concluded that, with the amendments recommended, the Colchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document satisfies the requirements of Section 20 (5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the associated regulations; is sound in terms of Section 20(5)(b) of the 2004 Act; and meets the tests of soundness in Planning Policy Statement 12.

Karen Syrett, Spatial Policy Manager, attended to assist the Committee in its deliberations. The Core Strategy had been a significant area of work. It sets out the long term vision and objectives for Colchester over the next 15 years. The Committee have had to take difficult decisions at times but there has always been a consensus view. The Inspector's examination took place in June and July and the main changes that the Inspector made, over and above those suggested by officers, related to two areas:

- the deletion of reference to a Park and Ride site to the east of Colchester, because the evidence base was not sufficient to justify an allocation, but it was not ruled out for the future. She also commented that proposals for a Park and Ride should be considered against policy TA3. This does not prevent a proposal coming forward in the future;

- the deletion of Areas of Landscape Conservation Importance and Green Breaks. The Inspector was mindful of national policy and concluded that there was no need to build in additional protection as there already existed sufficient protection at this stage. More evidence was sought for a Green Breaks policy and a study was under way which would form part of the site allocations document in due course.

The committee report highlighted some particular issues within the Inspectors report – new affordable housing policy for developer contributions and protection of employment land. The Core Strategy provides a robust basis for taking other documents forward.

Councillor Lyn Barton, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration, attended and, with the consent of the Chairman, addressed the Committee. She considered the document to be an excellent Core Strategy, providing a vision for the future to 2021 and beyond. She highlighted that all developers would in future be expected to make a contribution towards affordable housing, regardless of the size of the development. Also mentioned were transport measures which would contribute towards congestion busting. These included the new cycle town status and, by working closely with Essex County Council, the A12 junction. There were pressures on Colchester to provide development and the Core Strategy would enable it to be done in a sustainable way. The officers were to be congratulated. She considered it a worthwhile document and asked the Committee to recommend this very sound Core Strategy to Council.

Councillor Gerard Oxford attended and, with the consent of the Chairman, addressed the Committee. He also congratulated officers on the Core Strategy, but had some concerns, particularly regarding Policy H5, Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. He was not opposed to the aims of the policy but drew attention to the need for sites to be identified which were deliverable. He requested that a small group be set up to look at other site allocations and asked that a representative from the Highwoods Independent Group be included. He referred to the Severalls Lane site which, more than two years later was still awaiting proof of ownership of the land before progressing. Reference was made to a request that the Local Development Framework Panel be asked to look at the provision of suitable sites and Karen Syrett agreed to investigate the matter.

Members of the Committee congratulated Karen Syrett and her superb team on the achievement of a sound Core Strategy which had involved a great deal of work over a period of four years. When the process started other Core Strategies had been found unsound and the Committee were delighted that the Colchester Core Strategy had been found sound; they noted that only one other authority in Essex had achieved a sound Core Strategy. The Core Strategy was a thoughtful, logical document and would support Colchester during the next 20+ years and inform developers of what could and could not be built. The document would provide flexibility and would assist in resisting undue pressure.

Members of the Committee particularly welcomed the following elements of the Strategy:-



- the high level of urban design;
- provision for open space;
- sustainability built in;
- an ambitious five regeneration areas;
- the requirement for new developments to provide facilities for recycling and minimising waste.

*RECOMMENDED* (UNANIMOUSLY) to Council that, in accordance with Section 23(3) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the revised Core Strategy incorporating all the changes recommended by the Inspector be approved and adopted.

*RESOLVED* (UNANIMOUSLY) that, subject to the approval and adoption of the revised Core Strategy, the Spatial Policy Manager be authorised to deal with all the necessary adoption documentation and other consequential matters in accordance with the appropriate Regulations.

**Councillor Christopher Arnold, Councillor Christopher Garnett and Councillor Martin Goss (in respect of their memberships of Great Horkesley Parish Council, Langham Parish Council and Myland Parish Council respectively) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3)**

## **12. Site Allocations Development Plan Document Consultation Draft**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Strategic Policy and Regeneration on the publication in January 2009 of the Draft Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and associated Sustainability Appraisal for consultation. Appended to the report was the draft Site Allocations DPD with appendices. The consultation will commence on 16 January 2009 and run for six weeks until 27 February 2009. It would provide the public with the opportunity to comment on the Council's preferred options for future site allocation and development. Submission of a final document to the Government is scheduled for late 2009, followed by an examination in the early summer of 2010.

The overarching Core Strategy DPD sets out the spatial vision and strategic objectives and policies for the Borough up to 2021 and has been declared 'sound' by a Government appointed Planning Inspector. It will be considered for adoption by the Council on 11 December 2008. The policy direction in the Core Strategy has been used in the production of the Site Allocations DPD.

New regulations issued in June 2008 on Local Development Framework (LDF) consultations have removed the requirement to consult on a 'preferred options' stage and instead encourage ongoing consultation over an extended period leading to formal submission to Government. However, whilst the Council is no longer required to consult on preferred options, in this instance it is considered appropriate to do so given

that an Issues and Options stage has already been undertaken and a further stage prior to submission is needed to ensure full public consultation. The Issues and Options stage for both Site Allocations and Development Policies DPDs have been undertaken in tandem and it is intended that they will jointly be subject to this further consultation due to the close relationship between sites for future development and the appropriate criteria to determine their location, design and use.

Laura Chase, Planning Policy Manager, and Mark Edgerley, Planning Policy Officer, attended to assist the Committee in its deliberations. Mark Edgerley explained that it had been necessary to circulate an updated document at the meeting. Changes had been made to some explanations, the maps had been enlarged and there were changes to the A3 map of the Central Area (the Stanway growth area and settlement boundary) together with the removal of the following two sites for reasons set out in the revised site allocations document:-

- Land to the rear of the Hare & Hounds Public House, Birch, and
- Place Farm, Old Heath, Colchester.

There had also been some changes to Appendices 2, 3a, 3b and 3c and amended documents were also circulated. No changes had been made to Appendices 4 and 5. All sites identified as preferred sites have come forward as a result of housing land availability assessment or the Issues and Options consultation stage. Sites in Chapter 5 are preferred options and may be appropriate for further consultation.

In addition to the decision required set out in the committee report, the Committee were also requested to consider an additional decision to authorise the Head of Strategic Policy and Regeneration to make minor revisions to the document before the consultation period commences.

Patrick Mills, Myland Parish Council, addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 5(3). He congratulated the Committee and officers on their efforts in compiling the site allocation document. Whilst he did not necessarily agree with the content he recognised the work that had been done. He was particularly pleased that most of the comments made by Myland Parish Council have been referred to in the document. They related mostly to sites for community facilities because Mile End had no community facilities. The Parish Council hoped for the support of the Committee for more generous provision of facilities for the development to the west of Mile End Road and for those facilities to be available for the rest of Mile End. He understood that the Committee had initiated a detailed survey of community facilities which was to have been completed in September, however, he had yet to hear from the consultants.

In response it was explained that the Council was taking a borough wide look at community facilities and would contact parish councils on the outcome.

Councillor Gerard Oxford attended and, with the consent of the Chairman, addressed the Committee in respect of North Colchester being identified for the bulk of allocations. North Colchester had absorbed a considerable amount of development and he had been hoping for a more balanced approach for the future. He noted that

the former travellers' site was now allocated for housing, but considered that it could have continued in use as a travellers' site. He believed it had been closed to make way for new housing. He commented that Marks Tey was regarded as being potentially suitable for development were it not for the lack of infrastructure coming forward and that he believed that North Colchester had been in the same position but that had not prevented it from being allocated as a development area.

In response it was explained that the urban area was blank because there was a separate Colchester Borough Draft Proposals Map for the central area. The allocation of some areas for development and not others was the outcome of work done on the evidence base and sustainability appraisal, following which Marks Tey had been discounted and the growth area in North Colchester was supported.

Members of the Committee made the following comments on the Site Allocation Consultation document:-

- site reference 440, a strip of land off Ipswich Road between Old Church Road and railway line (Castle Ward), the whole site is considered unsuitable for housing;
- site reference S044, land between Mile End Road and Bergholt Road, part of the site to the north of the A12 is considered unsuitable for housing. The areas of land to the north and south of the A12 were linked only by a public footpath across the A12 and accordingly the site cannot be justified for inclusion on the basis that it is well connected. There was a request that land to the north of A12 should be excluded, alternatively the owner of the land could put their comments forward under the consultation process. It was noted that the text for this site makes reference to the section of the site to the north of the A12 being inappropriate for built development;
- part of site reference 162 and 261, Mile End Ward, known as Chapman's triangle, was also in Fordham & Stour Ward. Previous Planning Inspectors have found that development on this parcel of land would have caused material harm to the open countryside and directed that it be not included in the Local Plan. It was considered that it may have potential as a green wedge and the work on green wedges should be completed before this site is allocated for housing;
- there was a concern that building 2,200 homes in North Colchester was only viable if the transport links in Colchester and from Colchester to London were sufficient to cater for the increase in population;
- once the A120 is completed Marks Tey would come under pressure;
- concern at the inadequacy of infrastructure in Colchester and the inability for there to be any more new roads;
- the current site allocations document was in draft form for the purpose of consultation and there was a need for transparency and for the sites which had been submitted to be subjected to the process;
- some comments in Appendix 3(b) were useful and some were not, e.g. site 33, playing field at St James Primary School which indicates 'part of land residential allocation and part is Private Open Space' whereas it should indicate the land is protected. Site 433, frontage of properties 1 to 15 East Bay, which indicates 'Mixed Use Area B' whereas it should indicate the land is public open space.

The following remarks were made in response to the above comments:-

- on the draft proposals map for the central area the settlement boundary for Colchester is shown as a thick black line which goes along the A12 indicating the extent of development. This boundary excludes the part of site S044 which extends beyond the A12 but does include land at site 162, Chapman's Farm. It is advisable to include this latter site as submitted particularly because there are 3 or 4 other sites with similar circumstances. Part of site 162 was considered worthy of inclusion because that area could come under pressure towards the end of the period. The comments about land to the north of the A12 were noted and would contribute towards the work being done. Site S044, was open space in the north west of the site and across to West Bergholt. The notation under 'Current allocation' for site S044 could be amended to 'site to be included in North Growth area, white land north of the A12';
- in terms of consistency and ensuring there was an audit trail it was considered important to retain the sites in the document as submitted for the consultation process and the results would come back to the Committee in due course;
- other minor matters would be improved - an exercise would be undertaken to ensure that all wards were noted where sites crossed ward boundaries; improvements to be made to the contents; appendix 5, the map legend, to be improved/enlarged; an index at the front to be considered; appendix 3(b) site number 82 – Bowmont Close, should read Beaumont Close, also site number 255 – the comment should read 'land to rear of North Station Car Park'.

*RESOLVED* that –

- (a) The publication of the draft Site Allocations Development Plan Document and associated Sustainability Appraisal be approved for consultation with any minor amendments indicated above.
- (b) The Head of Strategic Policy and Regeneration be authorised to make any further minor amendments required prior to the consultation period.

**Councillor John Jowers (in respect of being a member of the East of England Regional Planning Panel and a member of the Regional Flood Defence Committee) declared a personal interest in the following item pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 7(3)**

### **13. Development Policies Development Plan Document Consultation**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Strategic Policy and Regeneration on the publication in January 2009 of the Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) proposed and associated Sustainability Appraisal for consultation. Appended to the report was the draft Development Policies DPD with appendices. An addendum was circulated at the meeting which contained changes to: DP4 – Protection of Employment Land and Existing Businesses; DP8 – Tourism Development; DP14 – Open Space provision for New Residential Development; and DP16 – Parking Standards.

The consultation will run from 16 January to 27 February 2009 and will provide the public with the opportunity to comment on the Council's preferred options for development policies to manage future development. Submission of a final document to the Government is scheduled for late 2009, followed by an examination in the autumn of 2010.

The overarching Core Strategy DPD sets out the spatial vision and strategic objectives and policies for the Borough up to 2021 and has been declared 'sound' by a Government appointed Planning Inspector. It will be considered for adoption by the Council on 11 December 2008. The policy direction in the Core Strategy has been used in the production of the Development Policies DPD. It is important to note that the draft Development Policies DPD contains a relatively small number of policies, given that many issues are sufficiently well covered elsewhere. The areas not covered by Development Policies (DP) are covered in principle in the Core Strategy with more detailed guidance provided by Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD).

New regulations issued in June 2008 on Local Development Framework (LDF) consultations have removed the requirement to consult on a 'preferred options' stage and instead encourage ongoing consultation over an extended period leading to formal submission to Government. However, whilst the Council is no longer required to consult on preferred options, in this instance it is considered appropriate to do so given that an Issues and Options stage has already been undertaken and a further stage prior to submission is needed to ensure full public consultation. The Issues and Options stage for both Site Allocations and Development Policies DPDs have been undertaken in tandem and it is intended that they will jointly be subject to this further consultation due to the close relationship between sites for future development and the appropriate criteria to determine their location, design and use.

Karen Syrett, Spatial Policy Manager, and Laura Chase, Planning Policy Officer, attended to assist the Committee in its deliberations. Policies contained within the document were to be considered in the context of national and regional policies and the Colchester Core Strategy. This is a similar document to the Local Plan and more detailed policies were contained in Supplementary Planning Documents.

Councillor Lewis attended and, with the consent of the Chairman, addressed the Committee. She referred to two applications in Lexden Ward in the last six months for residential properties to become facilities for people with learning difficulties. She was concerned that the Council did not have a relevant policy against which such applications could be assessed and she asked if this could be considered as part of the future development of policies. Karen Syrett, Spatial Policy Manager, responded that she would look into the matter.

In addition to the decision required set out in the committee report, the Committee were also requested to consider an additional decision to authorise the Spatial Policy Manager to make minor revisions to the document before the consultation period commences.

Councillor Oxford attended and, with the consent of the Chairman, addressed the

Committee. He referred to the addendum; there were many issues with averages for provision of open space and he questioned whether the document could refer to 'useful' open space. He would prefer at least 15% of the gross site area of developments to be provided as open space. In respect of DP16 – Parking Standards – there were housing areas with very little parking provision which causes problems in the locality. The policy will assist in easing congestion and improve the appearance of residential areas.

It was explained that this was a consultation document and parking provision would match Essex County Council parking standards which will be the subject of a consultation process early in 2009. However it was proposed to include residential parking standards in this policy so that the higher standards could be implemented earlier and the preference was to consult on the document as submitted and consider the responses. In respect of open space provision, again the preference was to consult on the document as submitted rather than insert the word 'useful' or increase the proposed minimum gross site area from 10% to 15%. It was also explained that a sustainability appraisal would be undertaken for all the options.

Members of the Committee made the following comments on the Development Policies DPD:-

- Policy DP6 – Agricultural Diversification and Rural Enterprise – was welcomed because it went a long way towards addressing the dilemma of competing policies concerning rural regeneration;
- Housing Policies – social housing should not be provided in pockets within a development;
- Open Space Policies – open spaces have been lost and there was a wish to correct this situation and also for open spaces to be provided across developments;
- Policy DP15 – Transport Infrastructure and Accessibility – was welcomed because it would provide measures to reduce vehicle dependency. Penalties were needed to bring about a reduction in the use of the car. Garage size was highlighted as an issue and it was explained that the Essex County Council document would be a Supplementary Planning Document which would contain a level of detail which might go as far as specifying sizes for garages;
- Policy DP16 – Parking Standards – there was a concern that parking restrictions were an issue, as was the parking of cars on pavements; the balance was not yet right. The proposed parking standards would go some way to improve the situation, but if matters were left as they were because no comments were received, existing and future problems would remain, a thorough review was needed. Colchester had a more stringent parking policy than neighbouring towns and there was a need to look at consistency and best practice from the Essex Planning Officers Association. If the standard was raised planning officers should be able to apply discretion depending on how close to public transport or the town centre is the development. There was a strong case for planning officers to determine that the minimum will apply where public transport is very good at that location, and the converse should also apply;
- Policy DP21 – Coastal Areas – refers to the provision of opportunities for adaptation to climate change, e.g. managed retreat. There was a concern that the

Marine Bill could extend the right to access to coastal areas provided for in the Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act. The Bill was just starting to be adopted but would have considerable implications on rural planning and it was requested that Planning Policy take into account the implications of the Bill.

*RESOLVED* that –

- (a) the report be noted and the Development Policy Development Plan Document be agreed for public consultation.
- (b) The Spatial Policy Manager be authorised to make any minor amendments required prior to the consultation period.

#### **14. Proposed Planning Guidance Note - The Wivenhoe Town Plan**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Strategic Policy and Regeneration on the adoption of the Wivenhoe Town Plan as a Planning Guidance Note. Appended to the report was the Wivenhoe Town Plan.

The Town Plan is a guidance document produced by the local community. Its adoption will add to the Local Development Framework evidence base and will provide up to date information for anyone making a planning application in Wivenhoe. Planning Guidance adds detail to policies already contained within the Local Plan/Local Development Framework. A Town Plan will have been produced with a high degree of community involvement and much of the information gathered from workshops, factual surveys and questionnaires will be useful to the borough council as part of the evidence base. This information can be considered when policy is created through the production of Development Plan Documents.

Karen Syrett, Spatial Policy Manager, attended to assist the Committee in its deliberations.

Eugene Kraft, Secretary of the Town Plan Group, addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Meetings General Procedure Rule 5(3). He commended the document to the Committee as a community effort which had taken more than 2½ years to prepare following the distribution of 6,500 questionnaires of which 25% had been returned. The document is a good summary of the opinion of people in Wivenhoe and he hoped that the Committee would agree to its adoption as a Planning Guidance Note.

*RESOLVED* that the report be noted and the Wivenhoe Town Plan be adopted as a Planning Guidance Note.



## Local Development Framework Committee

Item  
**7**

23 March 2009

<b>Report of</b>	<b>Head of Strategic Policy and Regeneration</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Laura Chase 282473</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>LDF Development Policies Regulation 25 Consultation Report</b>		
<b>Wards affected</b>	<b>All</b>		

**This report asks members to note the outcome of public consultation on the Development Policies DPD.**

### **1. Decision(s) Required**

- 1.1 Members are asked to note the outcomes of the Development Policies Regulation 25 Consultation which ran from 16<sup>th</sup> January to 27<sup>th</sup> February 2009. The views put forward during the consultation will assist officers during the production of the submission Development Policies document, scheduled for publication in September 2009 and submission to the Government following a six week consultation period.

### **2. Reasons for Decision(s)**

- 2.1 To enable Colchester to move forward with the process of production of the Local Development Framework.

### **3. Alternative Options**

- 3.1 None.

### **4. Supporting Information**

- 4.1. The Development Policies Issues and Options Report was one of three documents the Council consulted on at the end of 2007 along with the final version of the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations Issues and Options Report. The Core Strategy, containing the Borough's vision, objectives and broad strategy to 2021, was subsequently adopted in December 2008. It provides the basis, along with national and regional planning policies, for the production of the Development Policy Issues and Options report.
- 4.2. This Development Policy DPD will be, when adopted, used as tool to manage future development and guide the determination of planning applications. The process of formulating these policies has involved extensive cross-departmental working within the Council, notably with the Planning Policy and Development Management teams, as well as public consultation in line with national guidance contained in regulations, as updated in June 2008.
- 4.3. Copies of the Development Policies consultation document were circulated to a wide range of organisations and individuals, including all Borough Councillors and the required statutory organisations. The Council sent letters and/or emails to more than 450 individuals recorded on our Local Development Framework List of Consultees. The



revised Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for the document was made available on the Council's website and circulated to statutory consultees.

- 4.4. 40 organisations and individuals responded to the Development Policies consultation. The views received reflect the wide ranging nature of responding consultees. As such, they provide an invaluable source of comment on the appropriateness of proposed policies which will aid the process of refining the Development Policies and producing a final version of the document for submission to Government and subsequent adoption. These consultation views are particularly important in light of the lack of best practice from other authorities to draw upon. Nationally, only six stand - alone Development Policy DPDs have been adopted (some other authorities have had development policies adopted jointly with their Core Strategy) and most of these were adopted early on and were approved as special cases that were not to be used as templates for other places. Thus while national guidance points to the importance of developing a reduced number of criteria based policies that don't duplicate policies found elsewhere, detailed guidance on how this should be achieved is lacking. Further refinement of Colchester's policies accordingly will need to focus on the precise wording needed to strike the appropriate balance between flexibility and ensuring high standards, as well to cover the fullest range of circumstances with the fewest number and shortest length of policies.
- 4.5 A summary of the consultation responses is attached in Appendix A to this report. The responses cover a wide range of general and specific concerns, with a particular focus on new standards and requirements, such as private and public open space standards, parking requirements, housing design standards and assessments to be submitted with planning applications. GO-East highlighted a number of areas where they considered the policies duplicated policies found elsewhere, while others questioned whether some development policies might be better formulated as Supplementary Planning Documents or guidance. These comments will all inform the process identified above of developing clearly written policies that best meet the desired procedural outcomes of the new planning system along with ensuring high quality development for Colchester. Along with the revised policies, the submission document will also include a table for each policy noting other relevant national, regional and local policies and indicate which saved Local Plan policy they supersede, where relevant.

## **5. Proposals**

- 5.1 It is proposed that work is progressed on the Development Policies DPD to allow consultation in September and submission in November 2009.

## **6. Strategic Plan References**

- 6.1 The LDF helps facilitate the delivery of Colchester's regeneration programme and the Sustainable Community Strategy.

## **7. Consultation**

- 7.1 The consultation has followed the methodology and techniques set out in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

## **8. Publicity Considerations**

- 8.1 None

## **9. Financial Implications**

9.1 None.

## **10. Human Rights Implications**

10.1 The document was produced using a range of methods in order to enable as many people as possible to respond regardless of gender, gender reassignment, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief, age and race/ethnicity.

10.2 This document will work to increase individual human rights by increasing involvement in the planning process.

## **11. Community Safety Implications**

11.1 None

## **12. Health and Safety Implications**

12.1 None

## **13. Risk Management Implications**

13.1 The adoption of Development Plan Documents is intended to reduce the risk of inappropriate development. It provides the opportunity to offer consistent advice to landowners, developers, officers, Councillors and members of the public.

## Appendix A -Summary of Responses

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
<b>General Comments</b>				
1	East Donyland Parish Council	General	Glossary of terms and initials should be included – ie 'RA' not explained (Regeneration Area)	Agreed – glossary will be provided in submission document.
5	Essex and Suffolk Water	General	Specific policy needed on affordable housing exception sites for rural areas.	General principle established in Core Strategy ENV2 supporting provision of rural exception sites outside but contiguous to village boundaries. Further guidance will be provided in Affordable Housing SPD scheduled for adoption in autumn 2009.
6	CABE	General	General comments provided on opportunities in LDFs to support good design	Noted
8	Will Bramhill	General	Notes Core Strategy commitment to creating people-friendly street and encourage walking and cycling but it should be clarified in Development Policies to show that walking and cycling are not just confined to people-friendly streets. Adding policy to remove barriers to walking and cycling also needed.	Policy DP15 along with Core Strategy policies are considered to provide sufficient support for pedestrians and cyclists.
22	Langham Parish Council	General	Councillors broadly speaking support the document and its principles.	Noted.
33	Mr. Nicholas Chilvers	General	Insufficient space for light industry and employment (Fewer commuting to London).	The Core Strategy sets targets for employment growth within the Borough. The site allocations DPD will be seeking to allocate land for employment purposes. Development Policy DP4

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
				aims to protect employment land and includes B1(c) light industry as an appropriate use for such land. There is an oversupply of employment land to meet RSS targets.
35	The Coal Authority	General	No specific comments.	Noted.
37	East of England Regional Assembly (EERA)	General	<p>The consultation document does not raise any issues of general conformity in relation to the East of England Plan.</p> <p>Whilst the Council's approach to sustainable development is supported, the DPD should incorporate proactive measures for sustainable construction. Although there are requirements for high quality design, the DPD should include policy requiring new development to aim above minimum level of the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards unless further national guidance supersedes local policy.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy ER1 sets out the Council's approach to sustainable construction and BREEAM standards. Consideration to be given to further incorporation of this issue into the Development Policies DPD. The Council also have an adopted SPD covering Sustainable Construction.</p>
31	Bigwood Associates on behalf of Abberton Manor Developments Ltd.	Proposals Map	<p>The Proposals Map should be properly included in the Development Policies document with an appropriate key and a clear reference on that key to the policies for which the items in the key are properly referenced to.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposals map and key will be refined to better clarify the policies to which the allocations on the proposals map relate.</p>
23	Defence Estates	Saved Local Plan Policy G1	The Policy should be amended to encompass other MOD facilities within Colchester, in particular the MCTC and the	The level of change at the Garrison is not occurring on other MOD sites and therefore it is considered that detailed policies are not

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
			range facilities at Middlewick and Fingringhoe.	required.
13	Highways Agency	Saved Local Plan Policy ME1	Retention welcome as it will mitigate against adverse impacts on the existing Colchester A12 junctions.	Noted.
18	Myland Parish Council	Saved Local Plan Policy ME1	Services are not yet provided to serve the new development between Turner Rise and Nayland Road because the roads on the plans approved by the Borough Council are too narrow for buses. Assurances sought that the connecting road and express bus way will be undertaken at the same time as the new junction to relieve the pressure on local roads.	Noted
13	Highways Agency	Saved Local Plan Policy T8	Policy has not been saved, but clarification needed to avoid the risk of the Highways Agency becoming embroiled in detailed consideration of haulage depots.	Noted.
31	Bigwood Associates on behalf of Abberton Manor Developments Ltd.	Saved Policies	The policies should either be Development Plan Policy, which it seems they are not, or they ought to be saved if the Authority wish them to be saved in a fundamentally different form like Supplementary Planning Guidance formally adopted by the Authority. We suggest that this section of the DPD is removed from the sake of clarity, reference and legality.	This section was intended to detail which saved Local Plan policies would continue to be saved alongside the Development Policies DPD. The policies that would continue to be saved are generally area specific policies needed to complete delivery on a number of sites. SPDs cannot contain new policies.
31	Bigwood Associates on	Tests of Soundness	There are aspects of the Plan which in our view fail the Tests of Coherence,	Noted. The Development Policies DPD is an evolving document and any consultation

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
	behalf of Abberton Manor Developments Ltd.		Consistency and Effectiveness and should be reconsidered in part or in whole.	responses will be considered when refining the document to produce a sound plan.
<b>Preferred Policy DP1: Sustainable Development</b>				
1	East Donyland Parish Council	1	Energy standards should 'exceed' rather than just 'meet' minimum standards. Use of 'satisfactory' needs more explanation.	Wording in this area will be guided by Government policy. Developers would need to submit evidence to allow specific judgements to be made on extent of impacts and levels of quality.
3	Environment Agency	1	Support this policy and endorse parts (vi), (x) and (xi). We particularly welcome the incorporation of sustainable design and construction techniques as outlined under part (vi) and favour sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) for handling surface water runoff.	Noted.
4	Essex County Council	1	Add 'historic environment' in to list of features which should be incorporated into development.	Agreed
7	GO-East	1	Aspects of the policy could be made more locally distinctive or may repeat policy elsewhere: Criteria I, ii and vii may duplicate elements of CS Policy UR2, RSS Policy ENV7; PPS1 and PPS3 iii might be better expressed through specific guidance	Policy will be reviewed to ensure duplication is avoided and local distinctiveness is highlighted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
13	Highways Agency	1	iv may duplicate CS PR2 and RSS Policy ENV7 Criterion vi duplicates CS ER1 and RSS Policy ENV7 Criterion viii duplicates CS PR2 and TA1, RSS Policy T1 and PPG13 Support commitment to give priority to pedestrian, cycling and public transport access.	Noted
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	1	Support.	Noted.
18	Myland Parish Council	1	Include reference to parking and garden size even though these are referred to elsewhere. Provision of non-polluting lighting should be included and a maximum term for adoption by ECC Highways Development of greenfield site west of Mile End Road will not meet objectives of landscape enhancement and sense of place. Support layouts that take into account public transport. Rubbish and recycling facilities should be provided prior to first occupation of any site.	Guidance requires that duplication be avoided.  Lighting could be given a specific mention. Highways adoption is a matter for the County Council. Broad principle of site allocation already agreed through Core Strategy process.  Noted. Noted.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	1	The contents of the policy stray too far into the field of design which in many respects is a quite separate matter to issues of	To adequately consider the social, environmental and economic elements of sustainability it is necessary to address a range

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
29	Anglian Water	1	<p>sustainability. For example limb (iv). We wish to see the policy streamlined by solely addressing sustainability issues. We nevertheless support the generality of the approach rather than setting out prescriptive standards.</p> <p>Support the inclusion of water efficiency and water management and the reference to the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems where appropriate.</p>	<p>of issues in the policy criteria. Creating a safe and secure environment, for example, positively affects quality of life and community cohesion, and therefore helps improve social sustainability.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	1	<p>Clause (vi) should be amended to say "if possible exceed" and minimise both vulnerability and contribution to climate change.</p> <p>Clause (ix) should require good access rather than satisfactory.</p> <p>Recent court rulings suggest Councils may impose standards that exceed government targets.</p>	<p>Amendments to wording will be considered when redrafting the policy. The wording of the policy will need to be justified and founded on robust evidence.</p>
37	East of England Regional Assembly (EERA)	1	<p>Policy DP1 makes no reference to regional energy policies. Policy DP1 should include a locally-set renewable target similar to policy ENG1, or refer to national policy.</p>	<p>Significant cross-referencing has been avoided in the Development Policies DPD as to do so would make the LDF inflexible and complex. Core Strategy Policy ER1 states that new developments will be encouraged to provide over 15% of energy demand through local renewable and low carbon technology (LCT) sources. Consideration to be given to further incorporation of this issue into the Development Policies DPD.</p>



Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
<b>Preferred Policy DP2: Assessing the Impact of New Development</b>				
1	East Donyland Parish Council	2	<p>'Satisfactory' and 'acceptable' are subjective terms.</p> <p>Cumulative impact should be reflected in criteria for Health Impact Assessments</p>	<p>Standards would be evaluated in relation to evidence provided on how a proposal met agreed criteria. Selective application of requirements for below-threshold projects would be problematic, but cumulative impact could be addressed through context appraisals and evidence required to be submitted through other application requirements.</p>
2	Indigo Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's	2	<p>More detailed guidance and justification should be provided for Health Impact Assessments – only relevant for new residential development.</p>	<p>The principle and thresholds are derived from County-level guidance. The need for a Supplementary Planning Document will be reviewed</p>
2	Indigo Planning on behalf of Wharf Land Investments	2	<p>Thresholds for Health Impact Assessments are too low. More detailed guidance for HIAs needed if required.</p>	<p>The principle and thresholds are derived from County-level guidance. The need for a Supplementary Planning Document will be reviewed.</p>
4	Essex County Council	2	<p>Policy should also make reference to the need for Environmental Impact Assessments where appropriate.</p>	<p>Environment Impact Assessments are mentioned in the Appendix listing other impact assessments needed to be provided as part of the planning application process. Including a mention within the policy would duplicate national guidance.</p>
7	GO-East	2	<p>Better approach could be to include guidance on application requirements in an appendix or on the 'Making a Planning Application' Page on the website. Criteria I and ii appear to repeat elements of CS TA1 and PPG13.</p>	<p>Policy will be reviewed to ensure that its content is presented in the most suitable format.</p>

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
12	West Bergholt Parish Council	2	<p>Sources on advice and best practice for Health Impact Assessments should be indicated.</p> <p>More support needed for Parish Plans and Village Design Statements. New policy amplifying the need to consider the appropriateness or impact of a development on Parish plans should be included or failing that, DP2 could be expanded. Backlands development should be covered by a policy rather than just Supplementary Planning Document</p>	<p>Policy ENV2 provides support for villages to put forward Parish Plans and VDSs for adoption as guidance, which is considered to be the appropriate means of ensuring that non-statutory documents are given weight in the consideration of planning applications. Backland development is covered by general policies on design of new development. The SPD will provide an extra level of detail which is not suitable for the Development Policies DPD.</p>
13	Highways Agency	2	<p>Threshold of 30 car movements for Transport Assessments consistent with policy, but lower threshold would have been welcomed.</p> <p>Nil detriment could be specifically mentioned in relation to the need to reduce transport impacts.</p>	<p>Policy is considered to accord with guidance – lower threshold would require specific evidence. Policy will be reviewed, but it will be important to avoid duplication with HA policy requiring nil detriment.</p>
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	2	<p>Support. For DP2, would like to see deletion of 'significant' in relation to transport assessments – should be for any development that generates traffic.</p>	<p>Noted. Threshold is consistent with national guidance.</p>
17	David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside	2	<p>The policy should recognise the importance and role of the validation process but defer the detailed guidance to a SPD or planning application validation guidelines.</p>	<p>Policy will be reviewed to ensure that its content is presented in the most suitable format.</p>

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
18	Properties Myland Parish Council	2	All transport assessments should be made within six months of submission and should include the impact of all anticipated future development. Parking requirements should reflect realistic assumptions. Policy should include a proviso regarding reparation for damage to local roads by developers.	Transport assessments need to be carried out in line with national guidance and ECC requirements.  Policy DP16 provides for residential parking standards to reflect the type and intensity of use. This issues lies outside the scope of a planning development policy.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	2	The nature of this policy is more appropriate to that of a lower case justification or supporting text rather than a policy in its own right. We consider this policy needs to be redrafted to provide guidance on material planning considerations relating to the impact of new development rather than referring to the technical reports necessary to identify such impacts.	It would be inappropriate to attempt to identify all the material planning considerations that may be relevant. The policy will be reviewed to ensure its content is presented in the most suitable format.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	2	Clause (i) – Wording suggested to clarify that Passenger Car Units should be determined by the normal minimum number of parking spaces specified by DP16, or the number of planned parking spaces, whichever is the greater. Clause (iii) should indicate that a significantly lower threshold for Health Impact Assessment would be appropriate in cases where a pre-existing adverse	Details on the application of the policy may be more appropriately dealt with in the explanatory text. The incorporation of such wording will be considered when redrafting the policy.

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
36	Sport England	2	health impact has been identified. Object. Sport and Recreation should be added to the list of assessments provided in Appendix 3. This should include a section on the information that should be submitted with planning applications that may affect playing fields.	Agreed - assessments related to Sport and Recreation should be included within Appendix 3.
<b>Preferred Policy DP3: Community Facilities</b>				
4	Essex County Council	3	Policy to retain community facilities would make the designation of school sites as Open Space unnecessary.	Open space merits consideration in its own right, rather than as a generic community facility.
13	Highways Agency	3	Support – retention of community facilities and employment will minimise travel demand.	Noted.
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	3	Support.	Noted.
17	David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties	3	The need to meet cumulative criteria is too onerous. Meeting one criterion alone should be sufficient.	Policy wording is considered appropriate given the importance of retaining community facilities.
18	Myland Parish Council	3	Wording should be strengthened to take the form of a promise that community facilities will be provided. Emphasis should be on the provision of	Current policy wording is considered appropriate given the need to provide community facilities appropriate to specific circumstances. The Community Facilities Audit has been

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
20	Layer de la Haye Parish Council	3	new and refurbished community facilities. There should be a guideline table of required facilities for each parish over 10-15 years. Parish Council not aware of Community Facilities Audit or its findings. Separate policy needed for planning gain to ensure developers always contribute to community facilities.	completed and provides a profile of existing facilities. Further technical work needs to be completed to allow it to be put on the mapping facility of the Colchester website (C-maps). The identification of required facilities for parishes is intended to be linked to the development of Parish Plans. Developer contributions and community facilities are covered by Core Strategy Policies SD2 and SD3 which are considered to provide the appropriate means for ensuring a coordinated approach to planning contributions and the delivery of community facilities. Noted.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	3	Support – Policy is relevant and clear.	Noted.
30	Theatres Trust	3	Support. Good quality community and cultural facilities are essential components in the development of sustainable communities. Support.	Noted.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	3	Object. Principle of the policy is supported. Need to make detailed aspects of the policy more robust. Would be helpful if the policy referred to the evidence base along	Noted.
36	Sport England	3	Consideration to be given to including better reference to the evidence base with regards to Sport and Recreation, and to including wording confirming Sport England will be consulted on	Noted.

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
			with cross-referencing to other policies in the Core Strategy. Appropriate wording should be included in the explanatory text which confirms Sport England will be consulted on any assessment regarding existing and future sporting needs of the community.	assessments. Significant cross-referencing, however, has been avoided in the Development Policies DPD as to do so would make the LDF inflexible and complex.
<b>Preferred Policy DP4: Appropriate Employment Uses and Protection of Employment Land and Existing Businesses</b>				
2	Indigo Planning on behalf of Wharf Land Investments	4	Agreed with need to protect employment land, however Rowhedge Port site is no longer suitable for employment use.	Principle of redevelopment for non-employment uses at Rowhedge Port has been acknowledged in Supplementary Planning Document for the site. The Proposals Map will reflect this.
2	Indigo Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's	4	Land to the North of London Road at Tollgate should not be protected for employment use and should be allocated for retail use – this has been accepted by Council's granting of outline permission for a replacement involving a 'land swap' providing employment use in the former retail site.	Noted – the submission Proposals Map will reflect the correct current use.
7	GO-East	4	Questioned if policy backed up by up-to-date assessment of employment land which indicates that the uses indicated will need to be safeguarded.	LDF policies are validated by a 2007 Employment Land Survey and ongoing monitoring by the Enterprise team.
13	Highways Agency	4	Support – retention of community facilities and employment will minimise travel demand.	Noted.
18	Myland Parish	4	Retailing should not be limited. Small local	The policy is directed at ensuring that retailing

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
	Council		retailers would enhance the community.	uses do not predominate in areas safeguarded for business uses. It would not preclude the development of small local retailers, and their importance is highlighted by CS Policy CE2c which safeguards local shops.
20	Laver de la Haye Parish Council	4	Support – These policies are consistent with discussions held and decisions made in Parish Council meetings. They are consistent with representations received from residents.	Noted.
21	Holmes Antill	4	The policy acknowledges that a range of employment uses are acceptable which is supported. The range should also include employment generating uses such as hotels (especially business hotels). Mixed uses should be further embraced.	Colchester's adopted Core Strategy recognises the employment generating benefits of hotel uses and identifies them as uses suited to mixed use centres and secondary land uses in employment zones. The policy will be reviewed to ensure clarity.
23	Defence Estates	4	New employment opportunities should be provided by redeveloping brownfield sites.	Noted. Promoting the use of previously developed land is a key component of Colchester's Core Strategy. The Centres and Employment Policies in particular seek to direct employment development to sustainable locations.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	4	The word 'an' is superfluous in the sentence starting "any use that may have an adverse impact on an employment generation..."	Agreed - removing the word 'an' would aid clarity.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	4	Support.	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
<b>Preferred Policy DP5: Town Centre Uses</b>				
1	East Donyland Parish Council	5	Flexible approach to town centre uses preferred to avoid empty shops	Core Strategy and Development Policies provide flexibility for mixed use areas surrounding the Town Centre, but it is considered that it is important to retain a predominance of retail uses in the core Town Centre areas .
13	Highways Agency	5	Supports – retention of a strong town centre maximises the number and range of facilities accessible by non-car means of travel.	Noted.
14	Bidwells on behalf of Glanmore Investments (Turner Rise Retail Park)	5	Policy should be amended as suggested to provide scope for intensification of development in the North Station Regeneration Area and Urban District Centres providing this would not prejudice the Town Centre.	Current wording is considered to be most appropriate in the context of national guidance supporting town centres and the sequential approach to new retail development.
18	Myland Parish Council	5	Support	Noted
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	5	Suggest it should re-titled to make clear it relates to Colchester Town Centre only, or could it be expanded to cover the Borough's other town centres in West Mersea and Wivenhoe?	Consideration will be given to the need to clarify that this policy concerns Colchester Town Centre. Retail provision in District Centres is currently covered by CS policy CE2b
30	Theatres Trust	5	Support. Good quality community and cultural facilities are essential components in the development of sustainable communities.	Noted.



<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	5	It would seem appropriate to have a policy protecting retail areas in the three Rural District Centres, not just Colchester itself.	Noted. Policy DP5 is intended to apply only to town centres. Retail provision in District Centres is currently covered by Core Strategy policy CE2b.
33	Mr. Nicholas Chilvers	5	Indoor shopping precinct should be developed to match the offer by nearby towns.	Retail uses will be directed towards the town centre in accordance with the Core Strategy and Development Policies Policy DP5. These policies aim to promote the vitality and vibrancy of Colchester town centre. The retail attractiveness of the town will be enhanced by the regeneration of Vineyard Gate.
<b>Preferred Policy DP6: Agricultural Diversification</b>				
4	Essex County Council	6	Policy should require schemes involving the re-use of historic farm buildings to maintain and enhance the historic environment.	Agreed – policy will be worded accordingly.
13	Highways Agency	6	Supports – commitment to enhance sustainable means of transport welcome, albeit marginal impact in rural areas.	Noted.
18	Myland Parish Council	6	Support	Noted
20	Layer de la Haye Parish Council	6	Support – These policies are consistent with discussions held and decisions made in Parish Council meetings. They are consistent with representations received from residents.	Noted.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	6	The duplication of numbering in the limbs will be a source of confusion when cross-	Numbering of the policy will be reviewed to ensure clarity. Whilst farm diversification is

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
			referencing. The meaning of 'vulnerable to further expansion' is unclear. This limb should be deleted and any proposals of this type be left for determination on their own particular merits.	intended to support the rural economy there remains a need to avoid new residential development in inappropriate countryside locations. This section of the policy intends to make clear that proposals should be of a scale that does not require inappropriate supporting development.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	6	Support. May be a need to clarify that developments that would lead to a significant increase in road traffic will not normally be supported. The wording could be strengthened.	Consideration will be given to including further details under DP6 (vi) (access) and within the wording of policy DP7.
36	Sport England	6	Support. Would appear to allow for farm diversification into sport and recreation.	Noted.
39	Dedham Vale Society (DVS)	6	The comment in the explanation that the "Council will resist proposals that would harm the rural area" is most welcome and will serve to ensure developments are in keeping with their environment. Vehicular access via a totally inadequate infrastructure is a major problem in the rural areas of the borough.	Noted.
<b>Preferred Policy DP7: Employment Uses in the Countryside</b>				
4	Essex County Council	7	Additional wording on transport access suggested.	Agreed – policy will be worded accordingly.
7	GO-East	7	Some criteria repeat policy elsewhere.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication.
13	Highways	7	Supports – commitment to enhance	Noted.

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
	Agency		sustainable means of transport welcome, albeit marginal impact in rural areas.	
9	Tendring District Council	7	Definition of 'Rural Employment Site' needed in Development Policies to support Site Allocations designations.	Policies will be reviewed to ensure consistency with Site Allocations designations.
18	Myland Parish Council	7	Support	Noted
20	Laver de la Haye Parish Council	7	Support – These policies are consistent with discussions held and decisions made in Parish Council meetings. They are consistent with representations received from residents.	Noted.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	7	Numbering will be a cause for confusion. In the first limb (iii) the key issue is the bona fides of the original building and not its age. Reference should be made to the need to ensure that the original building was erected for genuine purposes. Apart from these points the policy is clear and comprehensive.	Numbering of the policy will be reviewed to ensure clarity. The reference to the purposes of the original building will be considered.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	7	Support. May be a need to clarify that developments that would lead to a significant increase in road traffic will not normally be supported. The wording could be strengthened.	Consideration will be given to including further details under DP6 (vi) (access) and within the wording of policy DP7.
34	Humberts Leisure on behalf of Park Resorts	7	Support. Park Resorts consider that the policy is permissive towards rural economic development in line with draft National Planning Policy Statement 4	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
		(PPS4).		
<b>Preferred Policy DP8: Tourism Development</b>				
3	Environment Agency	8	Support	Noted
4	Essex County Council	8	Hotels are defined in national policy as a category of town centre development requiring sequential site selection process – the policy appears to be materially in conflict with national policy.	Policy notes hotels would only be supported in 'suitable locations'. For hotels, this would entail showing the sequential test is met. The process for this is defined elsewhere in national policy and does not need to be repeated in local policy.
18	Myland Parish Council	8	The policy should be more pro-active to support new tourism opportunities	Agreed that the Council has a role to play in promoting tourism, but this is largely the responsibility of the Tourism team, while planning policy's role is to provide a supportive policy context.
21	Holmes Antill	8	Business hotels and budget hotels/ motels are not given due consideration. A separate policy may be needed given that business hotels are not generally connected with tourism.	Appropriate locations for hotel developments are covered by the Core Strategy Centres and Employment Policies. It is not considered appropriate to include reference to business hotels in the tourism policy. The Core Strategy policy, other Development Policies, and national guidance provide adequate consideration of this issue.
24	Mr Neil Osborn	8	The policy needs to demonstrate a more positive approach by supporting tourist development where a need can be shown to exist. It should also state that the Council will support the provision of new	Policy DP8 seeks to address needs or shortfalls for tourist development whilst also recognising the need to protect the character of the Borough. New visitor accommodation, whilst providing positive economic benefits, may also

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
			visitor accommodation.	impact upon the character and environment of the Borough and therefore it is considered appropriate to require a proven need or shortfall to be demonstrated.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	8	With reference to the Youth Hostel, the wording should clarify the preferred location is <i>Colchester Town Centre</i> .	Agreed – policy will be amended accordingly.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	8	General support.	Noted.
34	Humberts Leisure on behalf of Park Resorts	8	Object. Park Resorts supports the general policy intention and wording of the policy. The supporting text is not flexible enough as it provides greater support to the sitting of holiday lodges rather than static caravans. More emphasis is needed on the LPA's support for tourism development in locations that would help support existing local community services and facilities as well as local businesses.	Consideration will be given to ensuring the policy contains sufficient flexibility.
38	Little Horkesley Parish Council	8	Support. Policies DP20 (Dedham Vale AONB), DP19 (Maintaining Settlement Separation), DP18 (Nature Conservation and Protected Lanes), DP8 (Tourism Development) are regarded as particularly important.	Noted.
39	Dedham Vale Society (DVS)	8	If tourism, and particularly rural tourism, is to make a meaningful contribution to the local economy, investment is essential. In the explanatory notes it would be	Noted.

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
			beneficial to see comment on the need of CBC/ECC to invest in infrastructure projects within rural areas.	
<b>Preferred Policy DP9: Housing Tenure and Mix</b>				
4	Essex County Council	9	Policy could be better structured to avoid overlap/duplication. Reference to tourist accommodation already covered by DP8. Policy should point user to relevant evidence base documents on housing needs of particular sectors.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure clarity, links to evidence base, and avoidance of duplication.
7	GO-East	9	Repeats policies found elsewhere in CS H3, PPS3 and RSS H2. A better approach could be to provide a more spatially differentiated policy approach which sets out indicative housing and tenure mix for particular developments. Criterion v appears superfluous.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication and its content is presented in the most suitable format.
11	Kilmartin on behalf of Hanover Housing Association	9	Separate development policy needed for older people's housing.	Core Strategy Policy H3 and Development Policy DP9 address the need to ensure housing diversity for a number of specific groups including older people. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment contains detailed evidence to support the need for older person's housing which could support planning applications for new developments targeted to this group. The text will be amended to refer to evidence base documents.
17	David Lock	9	Support general thrust but are concerned	Policy is intended to ensure link between

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
	Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties		at the implication that applicants need to be armed with up-to-date local housing condition reports.	evidence base on housing need and the housing proposals that are brought forward – wording can be reviewed for clarity.
18	Myland Parish Council	9	Support	Noted
20	Laver de la Haye Parish Council	9	Support – These policies are consistent with discussions held and decisions made in Parish Council meetings. They are consistent with representations received from residents.	Noted.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	9	Under limb (vii) we consider there should be specific reference to the retired population to read “Seniors and the Retired”. We do not consider tourism accommodation sits comfortably in this list.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication. Sheltered Housing, Seniors, and Nursing Homes are all listed within the policy as sectors with specific needs.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	9	Proposal for consideration of housing mix is welcomed, as is the specific mention of housing for the elderly (seniors). Policy would be stronger if it gave an indication of how such overall mix is to be enforced. Higher ratio of housing encouraged.	Consideration will be given to providing further details on implementation within the explanatory text.
33	Mr. Nicholas Chilvers	9		Noted.
<b>Preferred Policy DP10: Dwelling Standards</b>				
7	GO-East	10	Repeats policy found elsewhere and contains a level of detail more appropriate	Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication and its content is presented in the

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
9	Tending District Council	10	<p>to an SPD or masterplan. More tailored approach to Lifetime homes may be needed.</p> <p>Requirement for minimum amounts of storage space would be difficult to enforce. Could be stated that it only applies to flats.</p>	<p>most suitable format. Approach to Lifetime Homes is intended to be consistent with other Essex and sub-regional authorities.</p> <p>Policy will be reviewed to ensure it is appropriate, but it would be used in conjunction with other criteria to ensure adequate space standards and high quality design. Not considered necessary to limit it to flats.</p>
18	Myland Parish Council	10	<p>i: Should read 'dedicated external useable storage space'.</p> <p>vi: Support provision of secure cycle storage in flats.</p>	<p>Policy will be reviewed to ensure it is appropriate.</p>
27	Andrew Martin Associates	10	<p>Criteria (i) of Policy DP10 is considered unreasonable and the policy contains no justification for it. Potential purchasers will make their own decisions about whether to buy a property. The requirement is overly prescriptive and should be deleted.</p>	<p>Potential purchases are constrained by what is available within the local housing market and this policy aims to ensure that development in Colchester is designed to a high stand Policy will be reviewed to ensure it is appropriate and.</p>
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	10	<p>This is the appropriate time for design to be addressed rather than DP1. Have reservations about the need to refer to 'storage space' under (i). The wording seems to impose pressures for storage buildings in front gardens which may have negative design and environmental quality implications. With regard to limb (v), we wonder if the first word should be encourage.</p>	<p>Criteria (i) is intended to address storage space issues and is particularly targeted at flats, although it would be overly restrictive to limit it exclusively to flats. The reference to 'within each dwelling unit' attempts to clarify that the policy is not seeking storage units within front gardens. These comments will be considered when revising the policy.</p> <p>Criteria (v) sets out the need for flexibility in all dwellings. The use of the word <i>encourage</i> is therefore not appropriate.</p>



<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
40	Cllr. Gerard Oxford	10	Level access properties are important and send a clear message to developers/architects to design out steps and ramps.	Noted.
<b>Preferred Policy DP11: Dwelling Alterations, Extensions and Replacement Dwellings</b>				
7	GO-East	11	Much of the detail of the policy may be more appropriate to SPD or a single amenity policy.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure its content is presented in the most suitable format.
18	Myland Parish Council	11	Conversion and extension provisos are adequately covered by national planning regulations.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication
20	Layer de la Haye Parish Council	11	Support – These policies are consistent with discussions held and decisions made in Parish Council meetings. They are consistent with representations received from residents.	Noted.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	11	Do not consider the term 'defined urban areas' to be clear as this does not seem to have any basis in relation to the settlement hierarchy in the Core Strategy. Under (b) (i) there is possible confusion over the meaning of the word 'habitable'. The policy should be amended to make clear it only applies to the replacement of dwellings which have not been abandoned or demolished and can be regarded as dwellings without the need for rebuilding which would be tantamount to a new dwelling.	Noted. The use of the term 'settlement boundaries' would be likely to aid clarity. Comments regarding the term 'habitable' are noted and will be considered when revising the policy in order to aid clarity. Controlling new dwellings in the countryside is obviously an issue of key concern for the planning process. The second sentence of Policy DP11 makes clear that these criteria apply outside the defined settlements. Criteria (iv) attempts to clarify that the rural context will influence types of design that will be suitable.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	11	<p>With regard to (c) (iii), it is not clear what facilities the policy has in mind. Each case should be considered on its own particular merits and this limb of the Policy should be deleted.</p> <p>Under limb (iv) reference is made to surrounding rural area, we believe this will apply in both urban and rural areas and therefore rural should be removed.</p> <p>Reference is needed to the need for good housing mix to avoid the loss of smaller more affordable units, for example, and also to a presumption against back-land development. Could include cross reference to DP14 to discourage developments that lead to an unacceptable loss of private community space.</p> <p>The policy should require that alterations and extensions do not result in open space below the level required for new development and consider the application of commuted sums to provide additional open space.</p> <p>The policy should indicate how applications that result in a loss of ground drainage are to be considered.</p>	<p>Consideration will be given to the incorporation of requirements relating to housing mix. The Council is producing a Backland Development SPD to clarify how applications for such schemes will be considered. A general presumption would likely be inappropriate. The proposed wording of policy DP11 already seeks to prevent cramped appearances or adverse impacts on residential amenity. Consideration will be given as to whether additional wording is necessary concerning levels of amenity space.</p> <p>Policy DP17 (Flood risk) currently seeks to address issues of run-off and drainage.</p>
39	Dedham Vale Society (DVS)	11	<p>Support. The policy provides firm guidance on what is acceptable.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
<b>Preferred Policy DP12: Historic Environment Assets</b>				
4	Essex County Council	12	Specific mention of Heritage Statements and archaeological evaluation should be made. 'Scheduled Ancient Monuments are now called 'Scheduled Monuments'.	Suggestion will be evaluated in light of need to balance detail with avoidance of duplication. Wording change agreed.
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	12	Support, with the addition of specific mention of Irvine Road Orchard and Roman Circus sites in DP12.	The Development Policies are intended to provide general criteria rather than site specific information.
18	Myland Parish Council	12	Mile End Village should be added as an Area of Special Character. Include Proposals Map within document	Special Character Areas will be reviewed to ensure that the concept is justified by policy and evidence. The Proposals Map is published in the Site Allocations DPD – its size may preclude publishing it additionally in the Development Policies DPD
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	12	Consider title should be simply 'The Historic Environment'.	Noted.
31	Bigwood Associates on behalf of Abberton Manor Developments Ltd.	12	It is not clear from this Policy or the Proposals Map where the 4 Areas of Special Character are identified.	The proposals map identifies areas of special character. The key and proposals map are to be further clarified.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	12	This policy could be generalised to include characteristic geographical features ('geodiversity'). The character of the setting of all such assets merits protection, not just the assets themselves.	The policy as currently worded considered all development that would adversely affect the features listed. This would include adverse affects on character.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
<b>Preferred Policy DP13: Retention of Open Space</b>				
4	Essex County Council	13	Policy should be split and reconsidered to avoid any overlap with DP3.	Open space merits consideration in its own right, rather than as a generic community facility
7	GO-East	13	The first part of the policy cross refers to other Council strategies but does not explain which elements of these strategies will be taken into account when considering planning applications. The remainder of the policy duplicates national policy.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication and clarifies references to other strategies.
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	13	Support.	Noted.
16	Irvine Road Area Residents Association	13	Support – DP13 is needed to protect what little open space there is.	Noted.
17	David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties	13	Support – policy broadly corresponds with PPG17 and offers flexibility by recognising that existing facilities can be used to meet demand.	Noted.
18	Myland Parish Council	13	The policy as worded is a charter for developers. There should be a clearly stated assumption that open space will be retained unless truly exceptional circumstances arise.	The policy is considered to provide an appropriate set of criteria for assessing proposals that involve loss of open space in the context of national policy and local evidence.

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
23	Defence Estates	13	Due to their use as ranges and training areas many MOD establishments have to be in open countryside. Some development must take place in rural locations, such as for defence purposes. Policies should recognise the special needs of the military.	Policy DP13 general deals with the retention of Open Space that has a recreational role or which is used by the public. Development within the countryside more generally is covered by Core Strategy Policy ENV1. This sets out the criteria which must be met where development requires a rural location.
25	PPML Consulting Ltd	13	Policy DP13 is not sufficiently flexible to allow for circumstances where it may be appropriate to allow a change of use or limited development of land that is designated as open space. Criteria should be provided to set out when change of use or redevelopment should be allowed.	The criteria provided within Policy DP13 allow for an assessment to be made of the importance of areas of open space and of any alternative provision that is to be provided. This provides sufficient flexibility within the policy to cover such circumstances. Open space is a valuable recreational resource within the Borough.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	13	The last paragraph of the policy should be reworded as the meaning is incomprehensible. Much work needs to be done to provide an appropriate policy basis for the retention of open space.	Potential improvements to clarity will be considered.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	13	Support.	Noted.
36	Sport England	13	Object: Policy is broadly supported but should be more robust. The explanatory text should refer to the specific criteria for assessing developments affecting playing fields (PPG17, Sport England Playing Field Policy) which are only partly reproduced in the policy. The reference to the Council's PPG17	Consideration will be given to clarifying these matters in the explanatory text.

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
			Audit and Assessment should make reference to this document being used to help inform the Council's assessment as it provides information on surpluses and deficiencies.	
<b>Preferred Policy DP14: Open Space for New Residential Development</b>				
3	Environment Agency	14	Provision of open space at new developments is supported. Open space can perform a double function by providing opportunities for SuDS schemes for surface water runoff management. It may be useful to mention opportunities for the creation of SuDS schemes under the supporting text.	Policy will be reviewed to include reference to opportunities for the provision of SuDs in the supporting text.
7	GO-East	14	Policy contains detailed amenity standards that may be better expressed through SPD. The final paragraph repeats Policy DP1 iii and viii.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication and its content is presented in the most suitable format.
10	Andrew Martin on behalf of RMPA	14	Amend to provide that private amenity space figures are to be used as a guide only	Policy already provides for adequate flexibility – important to ensure high standards of overall provision.
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	14	Support.	Noted.
16	Irvine Road Area Residents Association	14	Support – DP14 would ensure satisfactory levels of open space.	Noted.
17	David Lock	14	Concerned as to the practical implications	Policy reflects guidance in Essex Design Guide

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
	Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties		of inflexible requirements on garden size. A more responsive approach might be to relate garden size to floorspace volume by use of a ratio. Evidence for derivation of the flat-rate requirement needed. Support the emphasis given to the need for provision of open space in new development, but all forms of open space should be included in the guideline figure.	and Urban Place Supplement.
18	Myland Parish Council	14	Para 4 on private amenity space should be reworded to improve clarity. Para 5 should be reworded to provide that 'all new residential development will be expected to provide a minimum of 10% of the gross site area for new areas of accessible open space within the development. This open space is required to be of usable proportions not spread out as grass verges or small areas unable to be used by residents'. A specific provision should be made for Myland that 25% open space be provided to compensate for previous under-provision.	The policy will be reviewed to ensure it is clearly worded. In general, the development policies seek to avoid rigid requirements as they do not allow for flexibility to respond to local evidence or site specific circumstances.  Open Space levels will partially be identified for North Colchester through the ongoing Master planning for North Colchester
20	Laver de la Haye Parish Council	14	Support – These policies are consistent with discussions held and decisions made in Parish Council meetings. They are consistent with representations received from residents.	Noted.
27	Andrew Martin Associates	14	The policy is overly prescriptive and needs to be more flexible to take into account	The open space standards are intended to ensure that all development provides adequate

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
			the particular circumstances relating to individual sites. The policy also fails to address the importance of urban design within developments. The quality of the open space provided should take precedent over the quantity of space achievable.	amenity space. To have these standards merely as a guide may compromise their delivery. Consideration will be given to the degree of flexibility.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	14	Policy title should be changed to 'Private Amenity Space and Open Space Provision for New Residential Development'.	Potential improvements to clarity will be considered.
31	Bigwood Associates on behalf of Abberton Manor Developments Ltd.	14	The policy cannot reasonably be related to C2 uses such as Nursing Homes and "extra-care" housing for the elderly where there ought to be a different approach and a different formula or methodology.	The policy recognises that accommodation for the elderly may be one circumstance where a commuted sum may be accepted for local and/or strategic open space (alongside compensating increase in private amenity space).
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	14	Definition of unacceptable reductions in existing private amenity space could be clarified.	Comments noted. There is a need to avoid being overly prescriptive and to allow necessary flexibility in the policy to address all circumstances.
36	Sport England	14	Object. The policy states that the council will accept commuted sums in certain circumstances and further guidance is available in SPD. We request the Council to confirm this SPD will be updated.	Policy on planning contributions in general will be reviewed to accord with evolving national guidance.
40	Cllr. Gerard Oxford	14	It is very important as part of sustainable communities to have adequate open space where children can play safely.	Noted.



Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
<b>Preferred Policy DP15: Transport Infrastructure and Accessibility</b>				
1	East Donyland Parish Council	15	Policy should acknowledge that urban and rural communities have different needs.	Differences between urban and rural areas would be addressed through the policy's requirement that development proposals would be considered to ensure minimal impact on the existing transport network. Additionally, Core Strategy policies on appropriate rural development (SD1, ENV1 and 2) and more specifically, DP7 on rural employment sites would also address rural transport impacts.
4	Essex County Council	15	Policy does not make clear the need to consider the refusal of developments that are proposed in locations that are inaccessible to community facilities. Hard infrastructure should also be included along with Travel Plans as a way of maintaining and improving levels of accessibility. Further additional wording changes suggested to avoid specific mention of an east Park and Ride site as the County Council will be seeking further sites in general to complement the northern site. In last para, support the deletion of 'particularly through encouraging the provision and use of renewable energy' under Alternative Options..	Policy will be reviewed, but would need to be worded positively rather than negatively to support the location of development in locations accessible to community facilities. Noted.  Policy will be reviewed in conjunction with the County Council.
7	GO-East	15	The policy duplicates elements of PPG13,	Agreed.  Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
13	Highways Agency	15	RSS T1-T4, CS Policies TA1 and TA3 and Policy DP2. Supports – policy is of critical interest in promoting sustainable travel. In particular, criteria for Park and Ride and freight facilities welcomed.	duplication Noted.
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	15	Support.	Noted.
17	David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties	15	Too much emphasis is being placed on securing highways capacity. An amended version of the first paragraph which would relate to a clause requiring the highway authority's agreement might prove to be more flexible.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure it reflects commitment to developing sustainable transport.
18	Myland Parish Council	15	Support	Noted
26	DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Williamson Developments	15	Despite reference under DP15 to a North and East Park and Ride, CBC has no clear committed plans for a Park and Ride in the North of Colchester. The North Park and Ride is dependant on national funding and if it is successful a site is still needed in the short term. CBC has not put enough emphasis on the importance of Park and Ride and the need to secure alternative sites. A site in Langham would provide a appropriate and suitable location for a Park and Ride.	The examination process on the Core Strategy considered the appropriateness of a Park and Ride in North Colchester. With Essex County Council we are committed to deliver a Park and Ride site to the north of the A12 at Cuckoo Farm. This was found to be the most appropriate strategy by the Inspector and forms part of the Adopted Core Strategy. A site to the north of the A12 has been allocated in the Site Allocations Document. Funding submissions have been made to allow Park and Ride at Cuckoo Farm to be delivered. Given the

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
				<p>commitment in the Core Strategy to a North Park and Ride there is no evidence to suggest a need for an alternative Park and Ride site at Langham.</p> <p>Policy DP15 includes a section on Park and Ride and states that further sites to the East will be sought to continue to develop Park and Ride in Colchester.</p> <p>Potential improvements to clarity will be considered.</p> <p>The policy attempts to address all issues associated with transport infrastructure and accessibility and does not focus only on the sustainable modes.</p> <p>The policy seeks to ensure that sustainable transport infrastructure is incorporated into all developments. Proposals for park and ride, like proposals for other types of development, will need to be considered against all relevant development plan policies.</p> <p>The Council and ECC as the Local Transport Authority are clear, based on evidence, that priority will be given to a Park and Ride site in the north. Provision of additional Park and Ride sites will be agreed through further joint working with the County Council.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to ensuring the policy contains sufficient flexibility.</p>
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	15	<p>First sentence is meaningless and unattainable. Duplication of limbs will be a source of confusion. "it's" should read "its". Sustainable transport should appear in the title of the policy.</p>	
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	15	<p>Policy could promote the development of desegregated transport infrastructure in appropriate locations.</p> <p>The clause on Park and Ride should indicate that any potentially adverse impacts will also be taken into consideration.</p>	
33	Mr. Nicholas Chilvers	15	<p>Mini Park and Ride should be established to the South near to Mersea Rd.</p>	
34	Humberts Leisure on	15	<p>Object. The policy should note that there are generally no feasible alternative</p>	

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
	behalf of Park Resorts		options available other than the private car for reaching more remote rural areas and tourist facilities, particularly family holiday makers who may be bringing too much to use public transport. DP15 should be worded to promote non car modes of transport where possible, but recognise the reality of car based accessibility particularly for tourism accommodation, arrival and departure.	
36	Sport England	15	Object. Within the supporting text accompanying the policy a reference should be made to consideration of the guidance in Active Design where appropriate.	Consider the inclusion of a reference to active design in the explanatory text and highlight its potential role in creating sustainable developments. Health Impact Assessments should for major developments provide guidance on this.
<b>Preferred Policy DP16: Parking Standards</b>				
2	Indigo Planning on behalf of Wharf Land Investments and Sainsbury's	16	The Council should take a more flexible approach to parking standards for retail development and look at each site individually.	Travel destinations such as retail centres are likely to continue to have maximum parking standards to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. Additionally, developments will be expected to introduce travel plans.
4	Essex County Council	16	As well as type and intensity of use, the policy should refer to location. Under explanation, it would be better to refer to car ownership rather than purchase.	It is considered that the policy does do this. Agreed.
13	Highways	16	Could be scope for the Borough Council to	Noted.

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
18	Agency Myland Parish Council	16	positively encourage the development of low or no-car ownership zones General thrust of policy supported, but against any proposal to adopt a lower standard in the North Station area. Minimum levels of free public parking should be provided at community hubs. Defined standards needed for commercial premises, transport nodes, employment zones and areas with known parking problems such as the General Hospital, PCT and Community Stadium.	The parking standards being developed by the Essex Planning Officers Association will include a full range of standards for all types of development.  Station Travel Plan and North Station Masterplan work will inform parking provision and policy around North Station.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	16	Concerned at the increase in the minimum level of parking provision. This seems at odds with strategic policies to reduce the number of parking spaces in urban areas.	The policy recognises that attempts to restrict residential parking have not had a significant impact on car ownership and have led to design and parking problems. As currently worded the policy attempts to provide for minimum levels of parking on residential developments, to overcome poor design and parking problems. Travel destinations such as workplaces are likely to continue to have maximum parking standards to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. Additionally, developments will be expected to introduce travel plans
40	Cllr Gerard Oxford	16	The change to maximum standards some years ago has been an abysmal failure.	The new residential standards are considered to address the shortcomings of previous maximum standards.
<b>Preferred Policy DP17: Flood Risk</b>				

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
3	Environment Agency	17	<p>'Recommendations' that Strategic Flood Risk Assessment findings should be followed should be replaced by 'required'.</p> <p>Clarification needed on the meaning of the term 'Local Drainage Plans'.</p>	<p>Policy will be reviewed to ensure its appropriateness and effectiveness, in conjunction with the Environment Agency and to ensure compliance with PPS25 and emerging national guidance on flood risk and Surface Water Management Plans.</p> <p>Policy wording to be reviewed to include universally recognised flood risk terms. In this instance reference to Local Drainage Plans should have read Surface Water Drainage Plans (if these are needed/prepared for large Green filed developments. Policy terminology will be reviewed during the preparation of the next Development Policies DPD</p> <p>Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication and its content is presented in the most suitable format.</p>
7	GO-East	17	<p>Duplication of national guidance in PPS25 and CS Policy ENV1. Alternative option would be to combine elements with Policy DP23.</p> <p>Definition of and justification for Local Drainage Plans needed.</p>	Noted.
17	David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties	17		
18	Myland Parish Council	17	Support	Noted
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	17	Prefer the policy to presume against any	The sequential test required by PPS25 applies

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
			new residential or non-maritime business development in Zone 2 and (especially) Zone 3.	to all new development.
<b>Preferred Policy DP18: Nature Conservation and Protected Lanes</b>				
3	Environment Agency	18	Support.	Noted.
4	Essex County Council	18	Support	
15	Painters Corner Residents Association	18	Support.	Noted.
16	Irvine Road Area Residents Association	18	Support – DP18 would protect natural habitats.	Noted.
18	Myland Parish Council	18	On the whole support; question how the biodiversity value of the greenfield allocation west of Mile End Road will be conserved and enhanced.	Noted. Site specific issues will be picked up in the SPD for the area.
23	Defence Estates	18	Positive management of the military estate should not prevent the MOD from developing establishments to meet changing military requirements. The policy should recognise the special needs of the military where development may be required in the national interest.	Policy DP18 provides criteria by which proposals that would cause direct or indirect adverse harm to nature conservation will be assessed. These criteria allow for consideration of the availability of alternative sites, the need for / benefits of the development, and the provision of compensatory measures.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	18	Support.	Noted.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	18	Support but policy should be strengthened.	Consideration will be given to amendments to

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
			Particularly, all proposals should seek to conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity rather than use of the word 'or'.	the wording.
38	Little Horkesley Parish Council	18	Support. Policies DP20 (Dedham Vale AONB), DP19 (Maintaining Settlement Separation), DP18 (Nature Conservation and Protected Lanes), DP8 (Tourism Development) are regarded as particularly important.	Noted.
39	Dedham Vale Society (DVS)	18	The protection provided by this policy is most welcome and serves to protect important areas within the countryside. It is noted that the provisions of the 2004 Colchester Plan which placed emphasis on restricting the growth of vehicular traffic in Protected Lanes has been dropped – this is regrettable and warrants inclusion in the Policy / Explanation.	Noted. The last sentence of the preferred policy states that protected lanes will be protected from proposals that would give rise to a material increase in the amount of traffic using them.
<b>Preferred Policy DP19: Maintaining Settlement Separation</b>				
17	David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties	19	Reference should be made to the circumstances pertaining to allocated sites to make it clear that allocated sites are not subject to the separation requirements.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure clarity.
18	Myland Parish Council	19	Support	Noted



<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
19	Rydon Homes	19	The policy makes the assumption that any area of land between the urban edge and the nearest village should be treated as a 'green break' which is not always the case. The policy should be reworded so that each development proposal can be considered against its own specific circumstances and is not subject to a blanket approach which could be unduly restrictive in situations where coalescence would not result from the proposed development.	The Green Breaks study will provide evidence base to support the application of this policy as it will identify clearly where there is a risk of coalescence between urban Colchester and surrounding land.
20	Layer de la Haye Parish Council	19	Support – These policies are consistent with discussions held and decisions made in Parish Council meetings. They are consistent with representations received from residents.	Noted.
24	Mr Neil Osborn	19	Policy DP19 goes well beyond a criteria based policy by referring to 'green breaks' in a way which strongly implies they are a specific entity which has been defined rather than determining criteria which would enable proper judgements to be made regarding sites that might be considered to erode the separation of settlements.	The policy will be reviewed to ensure it is appropriate. The Green Breaks study will provide evidence for the policy and for allocations.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	19	Support the need for such a policy. Broadly, we consider countryside protection policies provide the stringent protection needed to achieve this	The policy will be reviewed to ensure it is appropriate. The Green Breaks study will provide evidence for the policy and for allocations.

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
			objective. We note a reference to "Green Breaks" but these are not shown on the draft proposals map or the site allocations consultation document.	
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	19	Support. Clarification of 'amenity character' should be provided.	Noted.
38	Little Horkesley Parish Council	19	Support. Policies DP20 (Dedham Vale AONB), DP19 (Maintaining Settlement Separation), DP18 (Nature Conservation and Protected Lanes), DP8 (Tourism Development) are regarded as particularly important.	Noted.
39	Dedham Vale Society (DVS)	19	The DVS believes this is a most important policy.	Noted.
<b>Preferred Policy DP20: Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</b>				
7	GO-East	20	Clarity needed on uses permitted in AONB.	Document will be reviewed to ensure clarity on this point.
13	Highways Agency	20	Noted that A12 passes through AONB and any schemes for it would need to have regard to preservation of AONB amenity.	Noted.
18	Myland Parish Council	20	Support	Noted
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	20	There should be a wider landscape protection policy for the countryside to complement this Policy for the AONB.	The policy will be reviewed to ensure it is appropriate and consistent with the approach taken to DP19.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	20	Support general principles behind this policy.	Noted.
38	Little Horkesley	20	Support. Policies DP20 (Dedham Vale	Noted.

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
	Parish Council		AONB), DP19 (Maintaining Settlement Separation), DP18 (Nature Conservation and Protected Lanes), DP8 (Tourism Development) are regarded as particularly important.	
39	Dedham Vale Society (DVS)	20	The DVS welcomes the inclusion of a specific policy to cover the AONB. The phrase “in or near” probably requires further definition. This could be clarified in the explanatory text. The policy makes reference to “special landscape character” in the AONB but there are manmade elements that are also equally important in creating the landscape and should be commented on in the policy. It is felt due to the areas connection with John Constable the area is not only of national importance as stated in the explanation but of international importance. Policy comment on vehicle movements would be useful.	Consider revision of the phrase “in or near” or better clarify its meaning. Clarify that built or man-made parts of the AONB can be equally important to its character. Consider noting the areas international significance in the explanatory text. Consider whether point (ii) sufficiently covers adverse impact as a result of vehicle movements.
<b>Preferred Policy DP21: Coastal Areas</b>				
3	Environment Agency	21	Support. Assume the policy reflects the Government’s aims for an integrated approach to coastal management, as set out in Defra guidance. Clarification on this should be provided perhaps by direct	Agreed – policy will be reworded to include a reference to an integrated approach to coastal management and the associated Defra guidance in the supporting text

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
4	Essex County Council	21	reference in the supporting text. Support – consider changing the words ‘cultural heritage’ to historic environment assets’ to make it consistent with the terminology used elsewhere in the document.	Need for consistency agreed.
18	Myland Parish Council	21	Support, but would wish to see reference to the creation of a coastal path to link with the Essex Way at Harwich. The Essex Way skirts Myland’s northern boundary.	Defra are currently pursuing proposals for a new coastal path around the English coastline. Creation of new Public Rights of Way is the responsibility of Essex County Council who along with Natural England will lead on this issue. Discussions will be required with Essex County Council regarding this issue.
23	Defence Estates	21	The special needs of the military should be recognised.	Issues of over-whelming public or community benefit are covered by the final paragraph of the policy.
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	21	Support.	Noted.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	21	Support.	Noted.
34	Humberths Leisure on behalf of Park Resorts	21	Object. Needs to be greater recognition that further development of the coastal zone would be beneficial in terms of economic development. The policy should be removed as being contrary to the principles in para 24 of PPS7. If the policy is retained, we believe the last paragraph of the supporting text should be more explicit in explaining the need to allow for development in the coastal zone to allow	The Coastal Protection Belt is identified in Core Strategy Policy ENV1 and on the Core Strategy Key Diagram. The inclusion of the Coastal Protection Belt was required by the Planning Inspector in the interests of soundness. Preferred Policy DP21 provides more detail on development within this area. Consideration to be given to ensuring the policy contains sufficient flexibility.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
			existing businesses to expand and prosper.	
<b>Preferred Policy DP22: Equestrian Activities</b>				
18	Myland Parish Council	22	Support	Noted
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	22	The policy and supporting text are very negative. Equestrian activities are an important part of the rural economy. Proposals should be considered on their particular merits and should not be refused simply to avoid any increase in the rural housing stock. We do see merit in associating equestrian uses with existing buildings and dwellings wherever possible. We do not support any particular protection being afforded to the urban fringe as it is precisely this area, accessible to the urban population, that one would hope to find such facilities.	The proposed policy seeks to allow equestrian related development where this is necessary and provides criteria as to the circumstances in which equestrian related development will be permitted.
36	Sport England	22	Support the recognition and inclusion of a policy on equestrian activities. Support the statement that permission will not normally be granted for the conversion or change of use of existing equestrian establishments into a non-equestrian use.	Noted.
<b>Preferred Policy DP23: Water Conservation</b>				

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
1	East Donyland Parish Council	23	Use of subjective terms needs clarification – ‘satisfactorily met’, ‘no significant adverse impacts’.	Developers would need to submit evidence to allow specific judgements to be made on extent of impacts and levels of quality.
3	Environment Agency	23	Welcome the thrust of this policy. Water conservation is an important theme in the East of England. And is echoed in the Haven Gateway Water Cycle draft stage 2 report.	Noted.
7	GO-East	23	The policy appears to duplicate policy DP1 vi and xi.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication
18	Myland Parish Council	23	Support	Noted
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	23	Support. The ‘SuDS’ acronym may not be commonly understood and should be set out in its full form in the first instance.	Noted. Improvements to clarity will be considered.
29	Anglian Water	23	Support.	Noted.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	23	Support.	Noted.
<b>Preferred Policy DP24: Conserving Energy and Promoting Renewable Energy Sources</b>				
1	East Donyland Parish Council	24	Use of subjective terms needs clarification – ‘satisfactorily met’, ‘no significant adverse impacts’.	Developers would need to submit evidence to allow specific judgements to be made on extent of impacts and levels of quality.
3	Environment Agency	24	Support the thrust of this policy. There would be considerable merit in expanding the themes of Policies DP23 and DP24 in a supplementary planning document. Requiring developments to be carbon neutral should follow a stepped approach	Core Strategy Policy ER1 sets out how carbon emissions in housing development will be reduced in time with national requirements. The Council has an adopted SPD in place providing guidance on Sustainable Construction which will need to be reviewed as necessary.

<b>Respondent Number</b>	<b>Respondent / Organisation</b>	<b>Dev Policy Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CBC Response</b>
			in line with central Government objectives. This would equate to a requirement for all developments to achieve, under the Code for Sustainable Homes, at least a three star rating up until 2013, at least a four star rating until 2016 and a six star rating after this date. ODPM 'The Planning Response to Climate Change' provides good guidance and could be incorporated within supplementary planning guidance.	
7	GO-East	24	The policy appears to duplicate guidance in PPS22.	Policy will be reviewed to ensure it avoids duplication
18	Myland Parish Council	24	Support	Noted
28	Edward Gittins and Associates	24	Support.	Noted.
32	Cllr. Chris Fox	24	Support. Prefer the wording to indicate stronger support for viable schemes.	Noted.
<b>Appendices</b>				
24	Mr Neil Osborn	Appendix 2	Appendix 2 refers to the retention of existing saved Local Plan policies until such time as they are superseded by policies in DPDs other than the Core Strategy. Policy CO3 is indicated as being saved but during the Core Strategy examination the Inspector found the proposed Areas of Landscape Character Interest (ALCI) policy (which was to	Appendix 2 is intended to provide a guide as to which Local Plan policies have already been superseded by the Adopted Core Strategy. The Local Plan policies which will be superseded by the Development Policies DPD will be identified in the submission version. Local Plan policy CO3 remains saved as it has not been superseded by other policies. Saved policies will be reviewed to ensure their

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
38	Little Horkesley Parish Council	Appendix 2	<p>replace CO3) unsound and required it to be removed. The DPD needs to set out a clear criteria based approach to landscape appraisal based on evidence or it needs to make clear it will not apply arbitrary judgements about the landscape impact of development in DC decisions. Above all the DPD needs to make clear that Policy CO3 is no longer valid as it is not a criteria based policy and is not founded on any form of evidence base.</p> <p>Appendix 2 is welcomed showing the protection offered to rural areas has been extended to the Development Policies document.</p>	<p>retention is supported by Core Strategy policies. Saved policy CO3 is intended to be replaced by DP19 which will also be reviewed to ensure its appropriateness.</p> <p>Noted.</p>



### Appendix A Summary of Responses - Addendum

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
<b>General Comments</b>				
41	Boxted Parish Council	General	Any conditions applied to planning consent should be checked and enforced by the planning authority in much the same way as building regulations are monitored and adhered to. A regular five yearly review should also occur. This would involve employment of dedicated personnel but may be cost effective in the long term.	Noted.
41	Boxted Parish Council	4	Policy should only apply to Hill Farm Industrial Estate but if not then it is of concern and counter to DP7 in relation to the existing businesses in the village.	Consideration of employment uses would include the effect on existing village businesses.
41	Boxted Parish Council	6	Policy is considered to have limited relevance to the unique characteristics of their parish and its large number of smallholdings.	Noted.
41	Boxted Parish Council	7	The scale of conversion and re-use of rural buildings could become an issue.	Noted. The extent and scale of other new employment uses in the area would be a relevant consideration in the determination of applications.
41	Boxted Parish Council	22	Boxted has seen a significant amount of equestrian activity both on the smallholdings and on arable land that has been sold off in smaller parcels. Some existing activities are not in keeping with aspects of the policies.	Noted.

Respondent Number	Respondent / Organisation	Dev Policy Number	Comment	CBC Response
41	Boxted Parish Council	Local Plan unsaved policy EMP6	<p>While policies DP4, 6, 7 and 22 are considered to be acceptable in general planning terms, they are not considered adequate to deal with the scale of the situation in Boxted arising from the large number of smallholdings and resulting piecemeal and untidy developments. Local Plan EMP6 should be reviewed and retained in order to protect the appearance of the countryside, retain the rural character of the village and ensure that any existing and future developments are subject to control.</p>	<p>A policy applying only to one village is considered to be too detailed for a Development Policy. It is considered that the desired objectives of EMP6 can be met through the Development Policies referred to along with CS policy ENV2 and national policy in PPS7. Boxted's Village Design Statement will also be used to guide the consideration of planning applications in the village when adopted.</p>



## Local Development Framework Committee

Item

8

23 March 2009

<b>Report of</b>	<b>Head of Strategic Policy and Regeneration</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Mark Edgerley 282476</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>LDF Site Allocations Regulation 25 Consultation Report</b>		
<b>Wards affected</b>	<b>All</b>		

**This report asks members to note the outcome of public consultation on the Site Allocations DPD.**

### 1. Decision(s) Required

- 1.1 Members are asked to note the outcomes of the Site Allocations Regulation 25 Consultation which ran from 16<sup>th</sup> January to 27<sup>th</sup> February 2009. The views put forward during the consultation will assist officers during the production of the submission Site Allocations document and associated Proposals Map, scheduled for publication in September 2009 and submission to the Government following a six week consultation period.

### 2. Reasons for Decision(s)

- 2.1 To enable Colchester to move forward with the process of production of the Local Development Framework.

### 3. Alternative Options

- 3.1 None.

### 4. Supporting Information

- 4.1. The Site Allocations Issues and Options Report was one of three documents the Council consulted on at the end of 2007 along with the final version of the Core Strategy and the Development Policies Issues and Options Report. The Core Strategy, containing the Borough's vision, objectives and broad strategy to 2021, was subsequently adopted in December 2008. It provides the basis, along with national and regional planning policies, for the production of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD).
- 4.2. The Site Allocations document and associated Proposals Map will help manage future development by identifying the land allocations for every part of the Borough, based on the principles established in the Core Strategy. The consultation material showed the boundaries of the areas identified for growth in the Core Strategy as well as the boundaries of areas protected by designations ranging from the local to the international level.
- 4.3. Copies of the Site Allocations consultation document were circulated to a wide range of organisations and individuals, including all Borough Councillors and the required statutory organisations. The Council sent letters and/or emails to more than 450

individuals recorded on the Local Development Framework List of consultees. The revised Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for the document was made available on the Council's website and circulated to statutory consultees.

- 4.4. In total the Council received 320 representations from a wide range of organisations such as GO-East, Anglian Water, Highways Agency, Environment Agency and Essex County Council. Alongside these organisations a range of planning consultants and interested stakeholders including local residents and Town/Parish Councils also responded.
- 4.5. A variety of comments were received for every site and these can be seen on the summary table which accompanies this report in Appendix A. The table sets out representations in support and objection to each site. Where general comments have been provided for a site these are also included in the summary table to provide a comprehensive overview of the representation received.
- 4.6. Statutory consultees such as Essex County Council, the Environment Agency and the Highways Agency provided comments on each site as well as a range of general non-site specific comments. The working relationship established with these agencies during the formulation of the Core Strategy will continue as this Development Plan Document is progressed to ensure that any issues they may have with the sites being considered as new allocations are satisfied.
- 4.7. A significant number of the representations received at this stage related to the issue of village envelopes and settlement boundaries. At this stage no changes were proposed to the village envelopes shown in the Local Plan. However, the Inspector's report into the Core Strategy outlined that work should be undertaken to consider the suitability of existing village envelopes and to establish settlement boundaries for Colchester and Stanway, Tiptree, West Mersea and Wivenhoe. This work has commenced and the representations received will help inform the final report. This will be completed and made available prior to the next round of consultation.
- 4.8. A number of representations raised issues regarding the clarity of the A3/A4 maps and the key included within the Site Allocations document. During the consultation period, officers answered numerous questions which resulted from a lack of clarity and confusion with the maps. In response to these clarity issues officers intend to explore alternative options prior to the next round of public consultation which will rectify the issues faced during this consultation period. The key and the colours and shadings used (as seen on Page 19 of the consultation document) also raised various issues and it is expected that these will be rectified through clearer maps and the possibility of interactive LDF mapping.
- 4.9. The Site Allocations Representation form encouraged people to comment on the various sites, alongside a range of questions which related to the issues raised in Chapter 4. Many of the respondents to the consultation did not fill in these sections of the form so it is difficult to reach robust conclusions and results, however some of the key issues are identified below for information:
  - It was clear that the majority of respondents considered it appropriate to allocate school playing fields as Open Space, with a general presumption against developing them. However Essex County Council considered this inappropriate as the loss of primary school playing fields needs to be agreed by the Secretary of State and national legislation already resists loss of playing fields.

- The majority considered there is a need to differentiate between public and private open space. Many of the comments received regarding this question referred to the national open space standards per head of population and the different access and management techniques employed as a result of the open space allocation.
- There was strong support for the town centre remaining the primary location for retail development in the Borough, in line with Core Strategy policy.
- Areas of countryside between settlements were considered to require extra protection to retain settlement separation. The Council has commissioned a study which considers green breaks around Colchester and between settlements which will become part of the LDF evidence base.
- All the response received will be considered and used to inform the submission document.

4.10. Following this consultation period the representations received will direct the future path of the Site Allocations document. The document will now be refined prior to the next stages of public consultation, Examination in Public, and subsequent adoption in line with the Council's adopted Local Development Scheme timetable.

## **5. Proposals**

5.1 It is proposed that work is progressed on the Site Allocations DPD to allow consultation in September and submission in November 2009.

## **6. Strategic Plan References**

6.1 The LDF helps facilitate the delivery of Colchester's regeneration programme and the Sustainable Community Strategy.

## **7. Consultation**

7.1 The consultation has followed the methodology and techniques set out in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

## **8. Publicity Considerations**

8.1 None

## **9. Financial Implications**

9.1 None.

## **10. Human Rights Implications**

10.1 The document was produced using a range of methods in order to enable as many people as possible to respond regardless of gender, gender reassignment, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief, age and race/ethnicity.

10.2 This document will work to increase individual human rights by increasing involvement in the planning process.

## **11. Community Safety Implications**

11.1 None

## **12. Health and Safety Implications**

12.1 None

## **13. Risk Management Implications**

13.1 The adoption of Site Allocations DPD is intended to reduce the risk of inappropriate development. It provides the opportunity to offer consistent advice to landowners, developers, officers, Councillors and members of the public.

Site Allocations Regulation 25 Consultation

Site Specific Representations Received

S136 – Land at Queensmead, The Folley (Birch & Winstree)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment Site

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No issues raised in relation to environmental constraints on this site	Comments noted
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for rural employment use. It scored badly on sustainability grounds due its rural location and poor public transport links however likely impact on the A12 was regarded as minor as it is a small site.	The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	There is capacity at the nearest Sewage Treatment Works and there are no specific issues with this site.	Comments noted.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Object	Site not considered a sustainable location however ECC accepts that CBC supports the site for other reasons not associated with highways and transportation.	The Borough Council will continue to work with the County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/307	Mark Jones, Layer-de-la-Haye Parish Council	Object	Layer-de-la-Haye Parish Council support rural enterprises in principle but have issues about this particular site. Bus service is totally inadequate for use by workers/commuters and any significant volume of traffic is not possible along the single track road as outlined in proposed policy DP6 and DP7. Any proposal should be subject to a detailed traffic plan.	Comments noted.

**S127 – Cowdray Centre, Cowdray Avenue (Castle)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Mixed Use**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/002	Paula Baker	General	Found it difficult to interpret the red lines on the map and have concerns regarding the new roads and green links associated with this site. Need to improve the pedestrian links to the site and ensure that important habitats are not lost.	The Council does not intend any new road schemes in this area - the red lines on this map are shown to outline the North Station Regeneration Area. Officers have identified various issues with the maps and these will be rectified as the DPD develops. Comments Noted.
S25/065	Helen Harris Myland Parish Council	Support	Myland PC support the provision of high density housing on this brownfield site due to its proximity to the Town Centre and transport links. Providing high density housing at the Cowdray Centre reduces the need for 6200 houses on Greenfield land in North Colchester	The Council support the development of brownfield land as a priority set in the Core Strategy. Detailed proposals for the development of the Cowdray Centre will be included within the wider North Station Regeneration Area proposals. The re-development of this site will not reduce the minimum housing figures set in the Core Strategy.
S25069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using	Comments noted and any future development of the site will be expected to take account of the EA comments and the Core Strategy Policy ENV1. The Borough Council will continue to work with the EA to ensure any future



				SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits.	development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General		Site proposed for mixed use development. It was ranked good on sustainability rounds due to its proximity to Town Centre services and mainline transport links (railway). Its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minor due to the considerable distance of the site from the junctions 27/29 of the A12.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General		There is capacity at the nearest Sewerage Treatment Works and re-development of the site is unlikely to cause any future issues.	Comments noted.

**440 – Strip of Land off Ipswich Road, Old Coach Road and railway line (Castle)  
CBC Preferred Allocation - Residential**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No issues raised in relation to environmental constraints on this site	Comments noted.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for residential development. It was ranked as good on sustainability grounds due to its good connectivity with the Town Centre and surrounding services and facilities. Its potential impact on junction 27 of the A12 trunk road was regarded as minor as the site is small.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	There is capacity at the nearest Sewerage Treatment Works and re-development of this site is unlikely to cause any future issues	Comments noted.

**S298 – Arena Site, North Circular Road (Christchurch)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Mixed Use**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/001	David Poole, Andrew Martin Assoc on behalf of RMPA Services	Support	Site offers a unique opportunity within Colchester to provide additional residential dwellings, employment and leisure opportunities whilst acknowledging the constraints such as the Roman Circus. Opportunities exist to provide a landmark building on the site which will enhance the visual appearance of the area.	Comments noted and any future redevelopment of the site will have to accord with the adopted Garrison Master Plan as well as the Core Strategy and appropriate National guidance to ensure the appropriate mix and level of uses on the site satisfies all stakeholders.
S25/003	Roy Warren, Sport England	Object	Sport England acknowledges that sports facilities only comprise some of the existing on site uses. In order to avoid a scenario where existing facilities are lost, any site allocation should make it explicit that sports facilities which meet a community need should be retained or replaced as part of any future redevelopment in line with the guidance in PPG17. The Council's evidence base should be used to help inform whether a facility should be retain/replaced.	Comments noted and any future redevelopment of the site will have to accord with the adopted Garrison Master Plan as well as the Core Strategy and appropriate National guidance
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity	Comments noted and any future development of the site will be expected to take account of the EA comments and the Core Strategy Policy ENV1 and the adopted Garrison Master Plan. The Borough Council will continue to work with the EA to ensure any

			benefits.		future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked as good on sustainability grounds due its proximity to Town Centre and local services/facilities. Its potential impact on the A12 Trunk road was regarded as being minor due to remoteness of site from junctions 27/29 of the A12. .		Comments noted..
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	There is capacity at the nearest Sewerage Treatment Works but as the exact ratio and mix of land uses has not yet been agreed it is not possible to provide full details at this stage.		Comments noted.

**45 – Land to the west of Irvine Road (Christchurch)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Open Space**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/031	Mr P Egan	Support	Strongly support reallocation of site 45 as Open Space. Site has the potential to be a community asset and retention of habitats is important.	Comments noted. Reallocation of the site supported in the recently completed Local Wildlife Site Study which forms part of the LDF evidence base.
S25/045	Frances Kent, Irvine Road Area Residents' Association	Support	This old traditional orchard has lain undisturbed and undeveloped for many years and is important for local wildlife and biodiversity and forms part of the existing green link network.	Comments noted. Reallocation of the site supported in the recently completed Local Wildlife Site Study which forms part of the LDF evidence base.
S25/308	Richard Pettit, Painters Corner Residents Association	Support	Site is inappropriate for residential uses as it has no highway access and abuts existing open space. Site is important for wildlife and the Local Wildlife study confirms the site should be protected from development.	Comments noted. Reallocation of the site supported in the recently completed Local Wildlife Site Study which forms part of the LDF evidence base.

S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits.	The Council acknowledge the comments of the EA but as the site is not being promoted for future development and is expected to remain in its current condition reference to flood risk and ground water pollution may not be such an issue on this site.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	No score was given in relation to the sustainability of the site but its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as being minor.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Site being proposed for Open Space so any comments are not applicable.	Comments noted.

**S268 – Land south of A12 and to the rear of Wyvern Farm (Copford & West Stanway and part in Stanway) CBC Preferred Allocation – Part of site to be included within Stanway Growth Area and part to remain white land.**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/064	Jonathon Hills, Grange Marsh Properties Ltd	Object	Site should be allocated as employment rather than residential.	Comments noted. The Borough Council considered it appropriate to allocate the land as residential in line with the Sustainability Appraisal and the Core Strategy targets.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using	Comments noted. Any future development of the site will be expected to take account of the EA comments, Core Strategy Policy ENV1 and the future Stanway Master Plan (once produced and adopted). The Borough Council

S25/096	Essex County Council	General	<p>SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits.</p> <p>The Core Strategy recognises a potential need to allocate land for educational purposes around the Stanway Growth Area. Sites S268 and S070 represents a significant housing allocation which could trigger the need for a new primary school with commensurate Early Years and Childcare provision. The explanatory text should mention consideration and the identification of land where appropriate to meet these requirements.</p>	<p>will continue to work with the EA to ensure any future developments of the site satisfies their concerns.</p> <p>The Core Strategy outlines the infrastructure requirements that are expected as part of future developments in the Stanway Growth Area. The Borough Council will continue to work with the County Council as the Site Allocations document is developed prior to the next round of consultation.</p>
S25/097	Hills Residential	Object	<p>The site is less well connected to established facilities and services and any new housing would be at risk from noise and light pollution from adjacent strategic highway network. Alternative option is for the site to be considered as an extension to the adjacent employment zone.</p>	<p>Comments noted, the Borough Council considered it appropriate to allocate the land as residential in line with the Sustainability Appraisal and the Core Strategy targets.</p>
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	<p>Site was ranked medium in terms of its sustainability due to its links to the A12 however its potential impact on the A12 trunk road was regarded as major.</p>	<p>The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.</p>
S25/293	Mr Alan Brierley, Stanway Parish Council	General	<p>Site is small part of total land put forward. Important to prevent future westward spread of the proposed development between Stanway and Copford.</p>	<p>The Green Break study which forms part of the evidence base will identify areas where there is a risk of settlements joining up. It will assist with the identification of settlement boundaries and open areas that are important to retain.</p>
S25/297	Robert Pomery	General	<p>There are a number of inconsistencies,</p>	<p>Officers appreciate the difficulties</p>

	<p>Andrew Martin Associates on behalf of RF West Limited</p>		<p>inaccuracies and illogical features shown on various plans within Site Allocations DPD e.g. Stanway Growth Area boundary goes beyond settlement boundary, key not clear.</p> <p>Objection to the 10ha size restriction which has not been adequately justified. The western boundary of the newly urban settlement boundary of Colchester and Stanway Growth Area are arbitrary and bear no relationship to natural characteristics of western Stanway. Current boundary also ignores existing employment premises and extant employment permissions on Wyvern Farm. The Proposals Map boundary has been drawn excessively tightly in response to Parish Councils request to prevent coalescence between Stanway and Copford instead of following defensible boundaries.</p> <p>CBC needs to consider future land needs beyond the plan period for housing and employment in light of current RSS review or in case there is a shortfall in current plan period. AMA suggested an alternative boundary which would increase the size of the site to 18ha (15ha residential land and 3ha employment). The revised boundary would be defined by new woodland planting which would retain a sufficient green wedge of open land between Copford and Stanway and also provide land for development to help meet</p>	<p>many people faced with regards to the key and the maps contained within the document. These issues will be rectified before the next round of consultation.</p> <p>Site boundary was drawn to provide enough land to meet the Core Strategy targets for residential in the Stanway Growth Area, with justification provided in the Sustainability Appraisal Revised Scoping Report.</p> <p>Further work is being undertaken with regards to settlement boundaries and this may well have an influence on this site. As the site allocations document is developed further prior to the next round of consultation the Borough Council will work with stakeholders to ensure appropriate land is made available during the plan period.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			greenfield housing requirements.  This proposal presents an opportunity to reconsider the proposed redevelopment of Wyvern Farm. Overall the representation site for S268 would improve the form of development and make efficient use of land.  CS Inspector considered green breaks as an unnecessary tier of protection for land and removed them from Policy ENV1 in the Core Strategy. CBC needs to assess proposals for development in 'green breaks' in line with national, regional and Core Strategy policy as directed by the planning inspector.  Insufficient capacity at the nearest Sewerage Treatment Works for the level of growth identified on this site. It would therefore require increases to Copford Sewerage Treatment Works which already has limited land available.		The Core Strategy Inspector removed Green Breaks from the policy because the evidence base was lacking. As a result the Borough Council have commissioned a study looking at Green Breaks which will become part of the evidence base.  Comments noted. The Borough Council will continue to engage with all stakeholders and utility providers to ensure all aspects of sites and supporting infrastructure are deliverable
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General			

**S169 – Depot Site, Old Ipswich Road (Dedham & Langham)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/042	David Winter, Langham Parish Clerk	Support	Parish Council broadly supports the document and this site as outlined in Chapter 5.	Comments noted.
S25/084	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr A	Object	Whilst welcoming support for the partial allocation of the site for employment uses, the whole of the site has the benefit of a	Comments noted and the boundary will be re-considered. The proposed employment allocation

	Stevens			<p>Certificate of Existing Lawful Use of Development. This certificate extends across the whole site so the future allocation should extend across the whole site as well. Redevelopment of the site would see the current sui generis uses being replaced with a lower key and more beneficial employment use (Class B uses).</p>	<p>was drawn around the existing buildings to restrict the level of built development on the site.</p>
S25/096	Essex County Council	Object		<p>Site not considered a sustainable location however ECC accepts that CBC supports the site for other reasons not associated with highways and transportation.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
S25/069	Environment Agency	General		<p>Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits.</p>	<p>The Borough Council will continue to work with the EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.</p>
S25/099	Highways Agency	General		<p>Site was ranked medium in terms of its sustainability as access to the site is via the local road network. Its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minimal as there are established employment uses already on the site.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General		<p>Proposed Rural Employment Allocation doesn't define any potential discharge, therefore Anglian Water is unable to comment at this stage.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>



**S118 – Land to the rear of Bridge Farm (Marks Tey)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No issues raised in terms of environmental constraints on site	Comments noted.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Objection	Essex County Council and the Highways Agency unlikely to support the intensification in the use of the A120/London Road junction on highway safety and capacity grounds	The Borough Council will consider the allocation of this site in more detail with Essex County Council and the Highways Agency.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked medium with respect to sustainability due to the site's proximity to the A12/A120 and Marks Tey railway station. As the site is so close to the A12/A120 the impact on the Trunk Road network is likely to be significant.	The Borough Council will consider the allocation of this site in more detail with Essex County Council and the Highways Agency.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Issues with capacity at Copford Sewerage Treatment Works but as this site is being considered for rural employment there is no indication of possible discharge so unable to provide further comments at this stage.	Comments noted.

**S120 – Andersons Site and adjoining land (Marks Tey)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/013	Gordon Parker	Support	Owners of the site are in the process of preparing further information regarding highway issues. Currently in negotiations with both Essex County Council and the Highways	Comments noted and the Borough Council is also continuing work with the Highways Agency and Essex County Council on all

S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Agency relating to both the A12 and A120	aspects of highways and sustainable transport issues in the LDF.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Objection	No issues raised in terms of environmental constraints on site Essex County Council accept that it would be possible to gain access to the site from London Road, however the County Council and the Highways Agency unlikely to support the intensification in the use of the A120/London Road junction on highway safety and capacity grounds. Development at this location would also likely intensify the use of the remaining direct accesses between the A12 and London which is also unlikely to be supported by Highways Agency.	Comments noted.  The Borough Council will consider the allocation of this site in more detail with Essex County Council and the Highways Agency.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked good/medium on sustainability grounds due to its proximity to the A12. Its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as significant as the site is relatively large (8.15ha)	The Borough Council will consider the allocation of this site in more detail with Essex County Council and the Highways Agency.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Issues with capacity at Copford Sewerage Treatment Works but as this site is being considered for rural employment there is no indication of possible discharge so unable to provide further comments at this stage.	Comments noted.

**S279 – Old London Road (Marks Tey)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/013	Gordon Parker	Support	Owners of the site are in the process of	Comments noted and the Borough

			preparing further information regarding highway issues. Currently in negotiations with both Essex County Council and the Highways Agency relating to both the A12 and A120	Council is also continuing work with the Highways Agency and Essex County Council on all aspects of highways and sustainable transport issues in the LDF.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Objection	Essex County Council and the Highways Agency unlikely to support the intensification in the use of the A120/London Road junction on highway safety and capacity grounds.	The Borough Council will consider the allocation of this site in more detail with Essex County Council and the Highways Agency.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked good/medium of sustainability grounds due to its proximity to the A12 and even though the site is small because of its location close to the A12 its impact on the A12 is regarded as significant.	The Borough Council will consider the allocation of this site in more detail with Essex County Council and the Highways Agency.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Issues with capacity at Copford Sewerage Treatment Works but as this site is being considered for rural employment there is no indication of possible discharge so unable to provide further comments at this stage.	Comments noted.

**S037 – Land north of Axial Way (Mile End)  
CBC Preferred Allocation - Residential**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/313	Shelagh Gray, Tribal MJP on behalf of Royal London Asset Management Ltd	Support	Site is appropriate for residential purposes due to its physical configuration and relationship with adjacent land uses. If the site was to be developed for employment uses it would be likely to result in negative visual impact as buildings would need to be located at the front of the site and create a tunnel	Comments noted. As the site allocations document is developed further prior to the next round of consultation the Borough Council will work with stakeholders to ensure appropriate land is made available and deliverable during

			effect. Evidence presented to show oversupply of available employment land in the Borough and the re-allocation of the land is unlikely to have a significant impact on the Borough's employment targets. The site is surrounded on two sides by residential development and extra landscaping and planting could enhance the site's separation from the Flaktwoods site adjacent.	the plan period.
S25/024	Nicholas Chilvere	Object	In the future less people will be commuting to London and there is precious little employment land available.	The Employment Land Study indicated there is an adequate supply of employment land available in the Borough.
S25/065	Helen Harris Myland Parish Council	Object	<p>The Parish Council supports the alternative option to retain an employment allocation on the land north of Axial Way for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is valued as a future provider of local employment in Mile End</li> <li>• Mile End needs to retain employment land, as there is currently a lack of local employment in the area which increases the need to travel to work.</li> <li>• Thousands of homes with existing planning permissions are planned therefore the shortage of local employment opportunities will grow.</li> <li>• Local road and traffic conditions will worsen if the Axial Way site is developed for housing.</li> <li>• The PC strongly rejected the statement that the 'size and shape of</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted and the Borough Council will continue to explore the future use of the site following the consultation period and other comments received to date. As the site allocations document is developed further prior to the next round of consultation the Borough Council will work with stakeholders to ensure appropriate land is made available and deliverable for both employment and residential uses during the plan period.</p>

			the site makes it difficult it for employment uses'.	
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	<p>The parish council cited various sources of information including the Local Plan, PPS1, RSS, draft emerging Development Policies and the Core Strategy as evidence to support their objections.</p> <p>Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits.</p>	<p>The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.</p>
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	<p>Site was ranked as good on sustainability grounds due to good public transport links and employment opportunities. Its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as significant due to the size of the proposed development and proximity to the trunk road.</p>	<p>The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.</p>
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	<p>Capacity at the nearest Sewerage Treatment Works. No connections can be made to sewers to the east of the development site but they can be made to the northern relief sewer should the development take place.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

**S044 – Land between Mile End Road, Bergholt Road, Nayland Road and Boxted Road (Mile End and part in Fordham and Stour)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Site to be included within North Growth Area and land to the north of the A12 to remain white land**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/003	Roy Warren, Sport England	Object	Objection is made on the lack of clarity that is provided at present that existing facilities will be retained or fully replaced. The current recreation ground provides a community sports facility and it is considered essential that the existing facilities are either retained or replaced with at least equivalent facilities as part of the wider development of this area. The current reference to facilities being “anticipated” is not considered to provide sufficient clarity to developers and the community. Sport England request that any site allocation makes it explicit that existing sports facilities should be retained or fully replaced as part of any major development which would then give a clear policy steer for the North Colchester SPD.	Comments noted and will also be fed into the North Colchester SPD which is anticipated for public consultation autumn 2009. Sport England indicate that a reference including facilities being enhanced as well as retained/replaced may be appropriate and these comments will be included within the next Site Allocations consultation document.  The Council own the existing community sports facility/recreation ground and the intention is to retain or replace these with at least equivalent facilities.
S25/039	Arwel Owen, David Lock Associates on behalf of Mersea Homes and Countryside Properties	Support	Support the allocation of site S044 in accordance with the adopted Core Strategy but request that some detail be amended. The North Growth Area will be subject to a SPD which offers the opportunity to amplify the LDF policies. Changes which are sought include change to boundary in north west corner of the site, removal of green links from the Draft Proposals Map so that their specific location does not prejudice the conclusions of	Comments noted and these will be fed into the North Colchester SPD which is anticipated for public consultation autumn 2009 as the Borough Council continues to work with the stakeholders in the North Growth Area.

S25/061	Catherine Pollard, Boyer Planning on behalf of Colchester Golf Club	General comments / observation	the SPD and the existing open space allocations within the site should be subject to review in the SPD consultation process. Colchester Golf Club does not wish to object to the proposed allocation, but raised concerns on the future master plan design and the possible impacts on the Golf Club. It is necessary to provide a landscape buffer between the golf course and proposed development to reduce the need to erect high netting and/or removal of fairways and greens. Existing footpaths should for the basis of a green link which could be used as part of the landscape buffer which would provide the continued safeguarding of existing open space.	Colchester Golf Club is involved in stakeholder meetings looking at the North Colchester Growth Area and their comments will be fed into the SPD which is currently at the preparation stage and is scheduled for public consultation in autumn 2009.
S25/065	Helen Harris Myland Parish Council	Object	Myland Parish Council dispute that completion of the A12 junction will result in the Transit Corridor passing close to the Chapman Farm Triangle and are challenging the accessibility of the area.	Comments noted and these will be fed into the North Colchester SPD which is anticipated for public consultation autumn 2009.
S25/065	Helen Harris Myland Parish Council	Support	The Parish Council supportive of the allocation of land north of the A12 as white land. The PC also supports the protection of the last remnants of Chesterwell Wood.	Comments noted.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. Drainage ditches at risk of overloading and there are water quality issues. Loss of part of drainage system	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/096	Essex County Council	General	Suggestion that Broad Area For New Housing be changed to Broad Area for New Housing and Community Development to indicate that	The Core Strategy outlines the key facilities and infrastructure which is expected to be delivered as part of

			<p>open space, schools and other community facilities will be provided as part of development proposals. ECC have also requested that Early Years and Childcare are mentioned in the supporting text as they fall within site boundary. The allocation to the west of Mile End Road will require a north-south bus corridor to enable bus services to be provided within 400m of the new houses.</p> <p>Site was ranked medium in terms of its sustainability and its potential impact on the A12 trunk road was regarded as major. Site located adjacent to the proposed Junction 28 proposed which means site may be acceptable for development. However, because development of this site could have a major impact on the A12 it should be ensured that the design of the new junction layout takes full account of the proposed development and ideally the release of the site should be linked to the provision of the new junction. J28 would be first point of access to the site.</p>	<p>the North Growth Area. The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council in preparing the SPD for the area.</p>
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	<p>The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.</p>	
S25/305	Cllr Christopher Arnold	General observations	<p>Enhanced planting to be introduced along parts of the A134 with green links (minimum 100m width) being created from the NAR phase 2 to the A12. High landscape value of the view from the A134 into the Black Brook Valley should be preserved and enhanced to create a landscaped recreational corridor and retained as informal open space. Essential that the site must meet the open space needs</p>	<p>Comments Noted. The area will be subject to a comprehensive master planning exercise which will involve a wide range of stakeholders. A comprehensive master plan will present the opportunity to look at the whole site and the open space/recreational needs as a whole instead of in a piece meal</p>



			of the new population as well as the existing communities. Existing sports fields should be enlarged with improved facilities. Creation of new public rights of way is also supported and the developer should be required to provide a new recreational bridge across the A12 to improve the potential health benefits of the local footpath network. There is also a need to ensure that Great Horkesley remains defined as a separate settlement and the gap between Colchester is maintained.	approach. These comments will be fed into the master planning process that is on-going.
S25/311	Miss D M Bottjer	Object	Inclusion of land either side of A134 will result in the merger of Mile End and Great Horkesley. There needs to be a much wider green break between the communities	Comments noted. The area will be subject to a comprehensive master plan and these comments will be fed into this on-going process.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Capacity is available to the nearest Sewerage Treatment Works but Anglian Water will need to limit pass forward rate. Increasing size of existing sewers is also recommended to cater for the level of growth identified.	Comments noted. The Borough Council will continue to engage with all stakeholders and utility providers to ensure all aspects of sites and supporting infrastructure is deliverable

**106 – Wilson Marriage Youth Centre and land to the rear off Barrack Street (New Town)  
CBC Preferred Allocation - Residential**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/064	Jonathon Hills, Grange Marsh Properties Ltd	Support	Support the Council's preferred allocation on this site	Comments noted.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within 250m buffer zone for closed landfill sites. The EA highlighted the risk of landfill gas migrating off site through the strata below the	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site

				proposed development. A site investigation should be carried out by a qualified engineer prior to submission of a planning application.	satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General		Site proposed for residential development. It was ranked good on sustainability grounds as it is well located in relation to the Town Centre and local employment opportunities. Its potential impact on the A12 trunk road was regarded as minor due to the distance of the site from the A12 and the small scale of the development.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General		Capacity at the nearest Sewerage Treatment Works and re-development of this site does not pose any specific issues.	Comments noted.

**S026 – Land adjacent to Coopers Beach Holiday Resort (Pyefleet)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Holiday Caravans**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/009	Martin Taylor, Humberts Leisure on behalf of Park Resorts	Support	Allocation of this site will allow for continued investment and improvement of the Coopers Beach Holiday Park. Proposed allocation will contribute to local employment and offers the opportunity to improve the appearance and biodiversity of the land. Park Resorts support the site allocation and wish to make no changes to the CBC Preferred Allocation	Comments noted. As the site allocations document is developed further prior to the next round of consultation the Borough Council will work with stakeholders to ensure appropriate land is made available and deliverable
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site falls partly within Flood Zones 2 & 3. For sites in Flood Zones 2 & 3 and where the site exceeds 1ha, a Flood Risk Assessment will be required in compliance with PPS25.	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/096	Essex County	Object	Site not considered a sustainable location	The Borough Council will continue

	Council		however ECC accepts that CBC supports the site for other reasons not associated with highways and transportation.	to work with Essex County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Proposal to extend an existing Holiday/Caravan Park. The site was ranked medium on sustainability grounds however its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minor as it is located a considerable distance from the A12 although it may have several first points of access.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	West Mersea is a small Sewage Treatment Works but will need further details on the size and capacity of the proposed caravan site and how many months of the year these will be occupied.	Comments noted and further work will be undertaken regarding the capacity and usage of the site to inform the next stage of the Site Allocations.

**S109 – Land at Pantiles Farm (Pyefleet)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment and white land.**

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Support/Object	Summary of Comments	Council Response
S25/004	Sue Pullen, Winstred Hundred Parish Council	Support	Support the proposal to restrict the site development to the area around the existing buildings and to exclude storage and distribution activities. Parish Council welcome local employment opportunities but not to the detriment of neighbouring areas.	Comments noted.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No issues raised in relation to environmental constraints on this site	Comments noted.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Object	Site not considered a sustainable location however ECC accepts that CBC supports the site for other reasons not associated with highways and transportation.	The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.

S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed as a Rural Employment site. It was ranked poor in terms of sustainability and its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minor.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Fingringhoe Sewerage Treatment Works is a small filter bed works. Any significant re-development or intensification of this site will have a major impact on capacity in this area. No indication is given of possible discharge but there is unlikely to be any specific issues.	Comments noted.

**S128 – Land at Picketts Farm (Pyefleet)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment site and white land**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No issues raised in relation to environmental constraints on this site	Comments noted.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Object	Site not considered a sustainable location however ECC accepts that CBC supports the site for other reasons not associated with highways and transportation.	The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for residential development and for rural employment. It was ranked poor on sustainability grounds due to the site's poor public transport links. Its potential impact on the A12 network was regarded as minor due to considerable distance from the A12.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Fingringhoe Sewerage Treatment Works is a small filter bed works. Any significant re-development or intensification of this site will have a major impact on capacity in this area. No indication is given of possible discharge but	Comments noted.

			there is unlikely to be any specific issues.
--	--	--	--

**1250 – Land at Betts Factory, Ipswich Road (St Johns)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Mixed Use**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/011	Jonathon Davis, King Sturge LLP	Support	The Betts Factory has come to the end of its useful life and the company are looking to relocate locally. A residential led mixed use development of the site would be supported and help deliver the brownfield targets	Comments noted and the Council will continue to work with the landowners (and Tendring District Council) on a development brief for the site which will feed into the Site Allocations DPD.
S25/019	Cllr Ray Gamble	Support	No problem with mixed use on this site provided it is limited to a sensible business use. For example, would not wish to see noisy businesses and/or a fast food outlet on the site	Comments noted and the Council will continue to work with the landowners (and Tendring District Council) on a development brief for the site which will feed into the Site Allocations DPD.
S25/031	Mr P Egan	Support	If a development brief for the site is produced it might be worthwhile looking to see if the residential properties can front Ipswich Road	Comments noted.
S25/064	KJ Baines Welshwood Park Residents Association	Support	Residents Group agrees that the Betts Site is ripe for development however they are concerned about local traffic increase impacts on Ipswich Road.	Comments noted and the Council will continue to work with the landowners (and Tendring District Council) on a development brief for the site which will feed into the Site Allocations DPD. See below for comments from Essex County Council Highways and Transportation Department.
S25/002	Paula Baker	Object	Generally not opposed to a mixed use development on this site but need to ensure	Comments noted and the Borough Council will work to ensure that the

S25/035	Malcolm Inkster, Tendring District Council	General comment	that heavy restrictions are put in place to protect the environment in this area near Bullock Wood. The map shown on page 44 is misleading and shows part of the site in Tendring.	site is developed sustainably and has minimal impact on the surrounding environment. Comments noted, an area was shown in Tendring without an allocation in order to show the true extent of the site and a potential development brief to be delivered in partnership with Tendring District Council. Mapping errors will be corrected.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits.	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns
S25/096	Essex County Council	General	Improvements will be needed to public transport, cycling and walking facilities at this site. Contributions will also have to be secured for capacity and safety improvements along Ipswich Road particularly at key junctions and at each end of the road.	The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked good on sustainability grounds as it has relatively good public transport links. Its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as significant/major due the size of the site and its proximity to the trunk road network. Impact dependent upon the	The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.

				intensification of uses beyond existing employment uses.	
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General		Capacity available at the nearest Sewage Treatment Works and re-development of this site is unlikely to raise any specific issues.	Comments noted.

**S070- Land between Warren Lane and Dyers Road (Stanway)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Inclusion within Stanway Growth Area for residential**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/012	David Lander, Boyer Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey Ltd	Support	Support the inclusion of site S070 within the Stanway Growth Area. Highlight the links to the Core Strategy and documents in the evidence base including statements of common ground. The Borough Council need to ensure timing flexibility is built into specific sites within Growth Areas.	The Council will continue to work with the landowners as the Site Allocations document develops. There will also be a need to update work that was done as part of the Core Strategy – such as Transport Assessments and Site Implementation. A master plan will be prepared for the Stanway Growth Area
S25/064	Jonathon Hills, Grange Marsh Properties Ltd	Support	Support residential development on this site because it is the most sustainable location.	Comments noted.
S25/067	Indigo Planning Ltd on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Support	Support the preferred residential allocation of the site S070 (land between Warrens Lane and Dyers Road)	Comments noted
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.

			<p>developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits. Site within 250m buffer of Bell House Pit and Warren Lane landfill sites. Phasing of development needed to avoid environmental effects arising from adjacent quarry operations. The EA highlighted the risk of landfill gas migrating off site through the strata below the proposed development. A site investigation should be carried out by a qualified engineer prior to submission of a planning application.</p>	
S25/096	Essex County Council	General	<p>The Core Strategy recognises a potential need to allocate land for educational purposes around the Stanway Growth Area. Sites S268 and S070 represents a significant housing allocation which could trigger the need for a new primary school with commensurate Early Years and Childcare provision. The explanatory text should mention consideration and the identification of land where appropriate to meet these requirements</p>	<p>The Core Strategy outlines the key facilities and infrastructure which is expected to be delivered as part of the Stanway Growth Area. The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to deliver development in the Stanway Growth Area.</p>
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	<p>Site proposed for residential use. First point of access to site would be at J26 at Eight Ash Green. It was ranked as medium on sustainability grounds due to its relatively good public transport links and the potential impact on the A12 was regarded as significant due to the size of the proposed development and its proximity to the A12.</p>	<p>The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.</p>
S25/293	Mr Alan Brierley	General		<p>Any future development will have</p>



Stanway Parish Council			adjacent to this site. Trees on the site are already protected as is part of a hedgerow in Dyers Road (protected under Preservation Order). Reference needs to be made about the protected trees in the Site Allocations DPD document.	to take account of the current site constraints such as Tree Preservation Orders and habitats. Further details regarding site constraints and opportunities will be included in the next consultation document and the future masterplan.
S25/295	Lesley Scott - Boutell	General	Supportive of comments raised by Stanway parish Council regarding this site	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Site has been investigated to some extent and Anglian Water would have to carry out some major improvements (which have not been budgeted for) to the existing sewer system to provide capacity should the site be re-developed for residential uses.	Comments noted. The Borough Council will continue to engage with all stakeholders and utility providers to ensure all aspects of sites and supporting infrastructure is deliverable.

**S095- Land north of London Road (Stanway)  
CBC Preferred Allocations – District Centre**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/067	Indigo Planning Ltd on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Support	Strongly support the allocation of this land north of London Road as part of the Tollgate District Centre for the development of the replacement supermarket. Also support proposed land swap between the existing Sainsbury Site and the proposed store on the site to the north of London Road	Comments noted and the Borough Council will continue to work with a wide range of stakeholders to assist with the development of the Site Allocations document.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.

			<p>underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits. Site within 250m buffer zone for closed landfill sites at Old House Farm and Warren Lane. The EA highlighted the risk of landfill gas migrating off site through the strata below the proposed development. A site investigation should be carried out by a qualified engineer prior to submission of a planning application.</p>	
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	<p>Site proposed as a District Centre. It was ranked as good in terms of its sustainability and the potential impact on the A12 trunk road was regarded as minor. Highway Agency supports the strengthening of established District Centres as a way to possibly reduce road trips reliant on the A12.</p>	<p>Tolgate District Centre provides an important function locally for residents and communities and the inclusion of the proposed superstore will ensure that local needs are met and safeguarded in the future. The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.</p>
S25/293	Mr Alan Brierley, Stanway Parish Council	Support	<p>Stanway Parish Council supportive of proposed land allocation swap.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	<p>Major issues with the sewers downstream of this development at the southern trunk sewer. Further investment will be needed in this area if the development on this site takes place.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Borough Council will continue to engage with all stakeholders and utility providers to ensure all aspects of sites and supporting infrastructure is deliverable.</p>

**S242 & S243 – Land at Stane Park, Phases One and Two (Stanway)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Employment Zone**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/040	Julie Warwick, Holmes Antill	Support	Employment allocation at Stane Park is welcomed. A mix of employment uses is appropriate, including employment generating uses such as hotels. Comments also provided in response to the Development Policies DPD.	Comments noted.
S25/067	Indigo Planning Ltd on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Support	Support the preferred employment allocation of site S242 (Stane Park) providing the existing retail use on the existing site is transferred to North of London Road	Comments noted.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits.	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for Employment use. It was ranked good on sustainability grounds due to its relatively good transport links but its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as significant due to the size of the proposed development and proximity to the A12.	The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/293	Mr Alan Brierley Stanway Parish Council	Support	Supports proposed employment land allocation.	Comments noted and the Borough Council will continue to work with a wide range of stakeholders to

					assist with the development of the Site Allocations document.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Major issues with the sewers downstream of this development at the southern trunk sewer. Further investment will be needed in this area if the development on this site takes place.		Comments noted. The Borough Council will continue to engage with all stakeholders and utility providers to ensure all aspects of sites and supporting infrastructure is deliverable.

**S284 – Land at Colchester Quarry (Stanway)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Quarry Land**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/064	Jonathon Hills, Grange Marsh Properties Ltd	Support	Support safeguarding land for quarry uses, however there is no need to direct development away from these areas because each quarry has its own suitable buffer strip to ensure it is environmentally acceptable.	Comments Noted
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No comment provided for this site	
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for future quarry use. The first point of access would be Junction 26 at Eight Ash Green. The sustainability of the site was not ranked however its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minor provided there was no intensification of use at this site.	The Borough Council will continue to work with the Highways Agency to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns
S25/293	Mr Alan Brierley Stanway Parish Council	Objection	Strong objection to the current proposal in Reg 25 Site Allocations document to safeguard this site for future quarry use. Bulk of the site has been quarried and there are few minerals left in greater part of the site. An extension to Bellhouse Farm is already	The Borough Council have met with Essex County Council Minerals and Waste Team who have also identified issues with the proposals as outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation. The

			allocated in the Minerals Development Framework. Small area at Fiveways Orchard identified in Minerals LDF but not shown in Site Allocations DPD. Site on east side of Warrens Lane largely worked out. It is already used for a number of temporary operations. Safeguarding site for quarry use conflicts with long established plans to restore land for Informal Leisure use as it would increase scope for the intensification of quarrying related uses and jeopardise long established plans to restore land as open space.	land identified in the Minerals LDF outlines that the site will revert to informal recreation following the closure of the quarry. The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to ensure the details contained in the next consultation document are correct and more in line with the Minerals LDF and the interests of local stakeholders such as Stanway Parish Council.
S25/295	Lesley Scott-Boutell	Object	Support Stanway Parish Council's strong objection to this site proposal.	Comments noted
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	No specific comments to make on this site and the proposals	Comments noted.

**S294 – Land at Evergreen House & D Hollick Car Sales (Stanway )  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Employment Zone**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/067	Indigo Planning Ltd on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Support	Support the preferred employment allocation of site S294.	Comments noted
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS.	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.

S25/096	Essex County Council	General	On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits Improvements will be needed access to public transport, cycling and walking facilities at this site. Contributions will also have to be secured for capacity and safety improvements along Tollgate/Stanway area (as per S.106 Agreement attached to planning consents in the area).	The Core Strategy outlines the key facilities and infrastructure which is expected to be delivered as part of the Stanway Growth Area. The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns. Comments noted.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for residential development (Colchester Borough Council's preferred allocation is for Employment). It was ranked as good on sustainability grounds as it has relatively good public transport links its potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minor due to the size of the development and distance from the A12.	Comments noted.
S25/293	Mr Alan Brierley, Stanway Parish Council	Object	The allocation of this site for housing would be an anomaly-the site has had established employment uses for many years therefore allocating it for employment seems more sensible. (Colchester Borough Council's preferred allocation is for Employment).	The site is intended to be allocated for employment uses. The original representation submitted during the Issues and Options public consultation sought residential development on the site but the Borough Council consider the land more suited for employment purposes. Comments noted. The Borough Council will continue to engage with all stakeholders and utility providers to ensure all aspects of
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Major issues with the sewers downstream of this development at the southern trunk sewer. Further investment will be needed in this area if the development on this site takes place.	Comments noted. The Borough Council will continue to engage with all stakeholders and utility providers to ensure all aspects of

					sites and supporting infrastructure is deliverable.
<b>S286 – Land at Grange Road (Tiptree)</b>					
<b>CBC Preferred Allocation – Mixed Use incorporating sports facilities, residential and employment land</b>					
<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>	
S25/003	Roy Warren, Sport England	Support	The current proposal is supported in principle as it would offer potential to help address the outdoor sports deficiencies in Tiptree that have been identified in the PPG17 study. The proposal is seen as a positive response to addressing the community infrastructure needs identified.	Comments noted	
S25/049	Mrs McSweeney, Tiptree Parish Council	Object	Tiptree Parish Council does not want to see any more housing development before the necessary infrastructure is in place as current provision is inadequate. The loss of employment land is unacceptable unless other employment opportunities are put in place. Tiptree Parish Council strongly disagrees with the comments attributed to them in Chapter 5.	Comments noted. A summary of the meetings with town/parish council's was included to outline discussions to date. Future discussions are likely as the Site Allocations document is progressed further.	
S25/100 – S25/290	Tiptree Residents (190 reps received which are all identical)	Object	Vine Farm is grade II farm land which typically grows barley and corn. The Landscape Character Assessment (Nov 2005) outlines that the area should be conserved and enhanced and future development could increase the traffic pressure on rural and minor roads. Additional traffic pressure at Vine Road/Maldon Road and Vine Road/Kelvedon Road junction(s) would result as the junctions cannot be widened in this area. Both junctions lack public footpaths and there is no capacity	Comments noted and will be considered further as the Site Allocations DPD is progressed.	

			<p>to provide them. Increased visitors to the proposed community uses would bring additional traffic pressures at functions and evening events. The site has been supported by the Council partly due to the additional sport facilities that are to be provided with the development. Alternative sites for community pitches exist at Warriors Rest and land owned by CBC adjacent to Tiptree Sports Centre. The PPG17 study recommended siting new sports facilities at Tiptree Sports Centre which would make use of existing infrastructure and services. An alternative site in the south of Tiptree was also identified in the PPG17 study and not the site at Grange Road. There are several alternative sites available within the existing built up area of Tiptree to meet the Core Strategy housing target. Various Core Strategy policies outlined to demonstrate that the site proposal is considered contrary to existing policy and is not supported by a large number of residents.</p>	
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	<p>Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of Suds to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits</p>	<p>The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.</p>
S25/076	Edward Gittins &	General	<p>Not seeking to oppose an appropriate level of</p>	<p>As outlined in the Regulation 25</p>



	Associates on behalf of Mr D Clough		<p>growth in the north west of Tiptree if this is demonstrated to be the most appropriate location. The preferred allocations of the Council are unclear and the access arrangements off Kelvedon Road and Grange Road remain in doubt. Draft settlement boundary for Tiptree shown in Appendix 7 does not take account of the proposals which is misleading and has scant regard for its relationship with established development. The draft settlement boundary is unacceptable without clear definition of the long term uses on the site. Careful consideration of alternative options is required as indicated in the Inspector's Core Strategy Examination Report.</p>	<p>consultation document the Council at this stage did not support every element of the original proposal so it was inappropriate to prejudice the areas of residential, open space and sports facilities expected as part of this development. If this site is demonstrated to be the most appropriate location, further work will be carried out to ensure the exact boundaries can be shown in the next document.</p>
S25/080	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr R Martin	General	<p>Not seeking to oppose an appropriate level of growth in the north west of Tiptree if this is demonstrated to be the most appropriate location. The preferred allocations of the Council are unclear and the access arrangements off Kelvedon Road and Grange Road remain in doubt. Draft settlement boundary for Tiptree shown in Appendix 7 does not take account of the proposals which is misleading and has scant regard for its relationship with established development. The draft settlement boundary is unacceptable without clear definition of the long term uses on the site. Careful consideration of alternative options is required as indicated in the Inspector's Core Strategy Examination Report.</p>	<p>As outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document the Council at this stage did not support every element of the original proposal so it was inappropriate to prejudice the areas of residential, open space and sports facilities expected as part of this development. If this site is demonstrated to be the most appropriate location, further work will be carried out to ensure the exact boundaries can be shown in the next document.</p>

S25/096	Essex County Council	General	Report. Improvements will be needed in respect of access to public transport, cycling and walking facilities at this site. Contributions will also have to be secured for capacity and safety improvements along Tiptree/Kelvedon/Feering area	The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked as medium on sustainability grounds and the potential impact on the A12 was regarded as being minor/significant.	Comments noted.
S25/312	Sharon Tyson, Lawson Planning Partnership on behalf of Colchester United Football Club	General	Support the general principle of the allocation but have concerns regarding the specific wording as included within the Regulation 25 consultation document. Revised proposals comprise of sports training pitches with ancillary accommodation for Colchester United Football Club, residential development for a minimum of 140 dwellings, with public open space including a village green, community sports uses including playing pitches and an indoor sports facility, allotment gardens, landscaping and wildlife areas and employment generating development with a potential new access. Development of this site provides a good opportunity to plan for the future of Tiptree in a positive way by providing a range of complementary and compatible land uses by meeting identified needs. The site is expected to be come forward in a series of stages starting with the sports development of pitches and changing facilities for which a planning application has recently been	Comments noted. Details will be considered further.

				submitted. Residential development will then come forward north and south of Grange Road. A detailed transport assessment has also been submitted as part of this representation.	
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	General	Insufficient capacity in the local sewers. The nearest point with capacity is 780 metres to the south east of the site on Church Road. The nearest Sewage Treatment Works has capacity to accommodate the development.	Comments noted. The Borough Council will continue to engage with all stakeholders and utility providers to ensure all aspects of sites and supporting infrastructure is deliverable.

**S003 – Waldegraves Holiday Park (West Mersea)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Holiday Caravans**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/048	Captain Ian Crossley, Mersea Island Society	Support	Supports the Council's preferred allocation on this site	Comments noted.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site falls partly within Flood Zones 2 & 3. For sites in Flood Zones 2 & 3 and where the site exceeds 1ha, a Flood Risk Assessment will be required in compliance with PPS25.	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No environmental constraints issues were raised about this site	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Object	Site not considered a sustainable location however ECC accepts that CBC supports the site for other reasons not associated with highways and transportation.	Comments noted.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site was ranked as medium on sustainability	Comments noted.

				grounds and the potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minor as it is located a considerable distance from the Trunk Road although there are potentially many first points of access to this site.	
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	General	West Mersea is a small Sewage Treatment Works but will need further details on the size and capacity of the proposed caravan site and how many months of the year these will be occupied.	Comments noted and further work will be undertaken regarding the capacity and usage of the site to inform the next stage of the Site Allocations.

**S009 – Land adjacent to Waldegraves Business Park (West Mersea)  
CBC Preferred Allocation – Rural Employment Site**

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/048	Captain Ian Crossley, Mersea Island Society	Support	Supports the Council's preferred allocation on this site	Comments noted.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	No issues raised in terms of environmental constraints on site	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.
S25/096	Essex County Council	Object	Site not considered a sustainable location however ECC accepts that CBC supports the site for other reasons not associated with highways and transportation.	Comments noted.
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	Site proposed for Employment use. It was ranked as medium on sustainability grounds and the potential impact on the A12 was regarded as minor.	Comments noted.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	West Mersea is a small Sewage Treatment Works but will need further details on the	Comments noted and further work will be undertaken regarding the

			proposed employment activities in order to provide any further comments.	capacity and usage of the site to inform the next stage of the Site Allocations.
<b>S107 – University of Essex land between Colchester and Wivenhoe (Wivenhoe Cross and part in St Johns) CBC Preferred Allocation – Part inclusion in East Growth Area and part land no change to current allocations</b>				
<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Person Submitting Rep</b>	<b>Support/Object</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
S25/003	Roy Warren, Sport England	Support	The proposal to allocate part of this site for sport and recreation needs is supported in principle as it would offer potential to help address the growing demand for sports facility needs.	Comments noted
S25/026	Chris Fox	Object	Object to any proposal to make changes that would permit further development on Site S107. Green break should not be opened up to development and therefore should be no change to existing allocation(s).	Comments noted. The Borough Council is undertaking a green break study which will become part of the evidence base in due course which will consider the green break between settlements including Colchester and Wivenhoe.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	Site within Groundwater minor vulnerability zone. EA promoting the use of SuDS to manage surface water run off and recharge for major or minor aquifers. In areas with underlying aquifer characteristics then developers should examine the scope and suitability of ground conditions for using SuDS. On large sites SuDS can also help deliver biodiversity benefits. Site falls partly within Flood Zones 2 & 3. For sites in Flood Zones 2 & 3 and where the site exceeds 1ha, a Flood	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.

				<p>Risk Assessment will be required in compliance with PPS25. Site within 250m buffer zone of the Molar Works landfill site. The EA highlighted the risk of landfill gas migrating off site through the strata below the proposed development. A site investigation should be carried out by a qualified engineer prior to submission of a planning application.</p>	
S25/096	Essex County Council	General	<p>The County Council will have to be satisfied regarding highway safety and access issues. Development will be required to contribute towards highway/transportation improvements as per the adjacent Research Park.</p>	<p>The Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to ensure any future development of the site satisfies their concerns.</p>	
S25/099	Highways Agency	General	<p>Site has various points of access. The site was ranked as good on sustainability grounds due to its relatively good public transport links. The potential impacts on the A12 were regarded as minor/significant, due to the size of the development and distance from the A12.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	
S25/299	Andrew Martin Associates on behalf of the Wivenhoe Consortium	General	<p>The inclusion of S107 is welcomed and fully supported however the current allocation is insufficient to meet the University's medium term needs over the plan period and as such is not in conformity with the Adopted Core Strategy. Request that land to the south of Boundary Road is included in the Submission Site Allocations DPD and rejects concerns raised over the risk of settlement coalescence between Colchester and Wivenhoe.</p>	<p>Comments noted and will be considered further prior to the publication of the Site Allocations DPD.</p>	

			<p>There are significant constraints affecting land the University could potentially develop in the future - Listed buildings; Grade II Registered Park and Garden; Marshland to the west of the University – restricted on flood risk grounds; S107 already falls within East Colchester Growth Area and is already committed for housing; lack of suitable land within campus.</p> <p>The only available and viable option is to develop land to the south of Boundary Road.</p> <p>Essex University has to meet two objectives within plan period - identify additional sports facilities and accommodate academic development.</p> <p>Respondents also proposing an extension of 6.5ha to the northern edge of Wivenhoe to accommodate a new Health Facility, other facilities identified in the Wivenhoe Town Plan and enabling housing required to pump prime the Golf Academy and University facilities. The settlement boundary should be extended to accommodate these needs. PCT are supportive of the provision of a Health Centre as part of the new mixed use allocation proposal.</p> <p>Justification for this proposal includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) proposal meets University needs and local needs</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	---	--

S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	<p>ii) development proposals are confined to the edge of settlements</p> <p>iii) development in the break between Wivenhoe and Colchester although within Coastal Protection Belt does not impact on the open and rural character of the undeveloped coastline, its historic features or nature conservation interests.</p> <p>Unclear as to the level of development expected on this site and will need clarification before comments can be provided regarding capacity at the nearest Sewage Treatment Works.</p>		<p>Comments noted and further work will be undertaken regarding the capacity and usage of the site to inform the next stage of the Site Allocations.</p>
---------	-------------------------	---------	---	--	--



### General Comments

Rep No	Person Submitting Rep	Site	Summary of comments	Council Response
S25/010	Clive Kerr	Sites S273, S090 and S221 in Appendix 3c	Areas of land near Bullock Wood are important for wildlife, wild flowers and green areas which should not be developed. This green space is an asset to Colchester and should be retained	Comments noted
S25/008	David Williams, Great Tey Parish Council	Great Tey	Parish Council is pleased to see no expansion to the existing village envelope is proposed at this stage.	Comments noted
S25/007	Andrew Zachwatajlo	Retention of Open Spaces	Wish to see the following sites retained as green spaces: Maldon Rd/Drury Rd Allotments, Irvine Road Orchard and Allotments, The Green and Playing Field in Prettygate	Comments Noted. The LDF seeks to protect existing open space across the borough and the Council would not support development proposals on these sites.
S25/006	Rachael Bust, The Coal Authority	General Comments	The Coal Authority have no specific comments to make on the Site Allocations document at this stage	Comments noted
S25/005	Helen De La Rue, East of England Regional Assembly (EERA)	General Comments	EERA have indicated that the Site Allocations Regulation 25 document does not raise any issues of general conformity in relation to the East of England Plan	Comments noted
S25/002	Paula Baker	Open Spaces	There are not enough open spaces proposed in the document. More public open space needs to be made available both for human use and also wildlife use. The local authority should have stronger powers regarding the Sustainable Communities Act and PPG17.	The Borough Council have commissioned various studies relating to open space and green breaks across the Borough which will inform the Site Allocations document and other aspects of the LDF.

S25/003	Roy Warren, Sport England	General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sport England endorses the principle of all school fields being allocated as open space with a general presumption against development which accords with PPG17 and is considered to be justified locally in view of the significant deficiencies in outdoor sports facilities as identified.</li> <li>• DPD does not appear to have fully considered identifying sites for meeting existing and future outdoor sports facility needs, especially around the urban area of Colchester where deficiencies are particularly high. Site Allocations DPD represents main opportunity for planning to address some of the deficiencies and it is therefore recommended that additional suitable sites are allocated for meeting the identified need for both outdoor and indoor facilities.</li> </ul>	Comments noted and officers will continue to work closely with colleagues from Leisure Services and appropriate stakeholders to identify any possible opportunities across the Borough which can be included within the next Site Allocations consultation document.
S25/004	Sue Pullen, Winstred Hundred Parish Council	General sites in Peldon, The Wigborough & Salcott cum Virley	Parish Council agree with the conclusions that none of the sites in the parish are suitable for large scale housing development. Following a recent public meeting the clear message was that a small number of affordable houses would be welcomed if they brought families into the community. There is a strong desire to see a shop re-open in a suitable location, there is also an awareness that without such community facilities villages	Comments noted.

S25/014	Gordon Parker	Site 189, Land North of Birch Road, Layer-de-la-Haye.	will become unsustainable and die. Firm view that the village envelope should not be changed and that the existing open spaces and woodland in the parish are valued amenities which must be retained. Site currently in Appendix 3a and could be appropriate for affordable housing scheme. Request that the site is considered in the next stage of consultation where detailed representations will be made.	The Site Allocations document will not allocate land for affordable housing as these sites are delivered as exceptions in accordance with Core Strategy policy H4.
S25/015	Gordon Parker	Site 185 & 213. Land at The Folly, Layer-de-la-Haye	The site(s) is available immediately to help address the affordable housing issue within the Borough. Further consideration should be given to allocating this land for affordable housing.	The Site Allocations document will not allocate land for affordable housing as these sites are delivered as exceptions in accordance with Core Strategy policy H4.
S25/016	Gordon Parker	S078, Land at Hardings Close, Aldham	The Landowner is content with the site being developed for affordable housing and seeks support for development of this site.	The Site Allocations document will not allocate land for affordable housing as these sites are delivered as exceptions in accordance with Core Strategy policy H4.
S25/017	Eugene Kraft	Sites in Wivenhoe – 1136, 1137, 1135, 180, 181, 247	Accepts that development on land allocated as residential would not be supported by the Council but areas such as The Nook, Bobbits Way and the open space opposite Milfields School, should be allocated as Open Space as outlined in the Wivenhoe Town Plan	Comments noted and the Borough Council will work in partnership with Wivenhoe Town Council and appropriate stakeholders to incorporate appropriate elements of the Town Plan into the LDF.
S25/018	Angus Forrest	Land at Swan Grove, Chappel	Requests that this site be considered for rural housing development as indicated by the Parish Council on page 61 of the Site Allocations document. Site could be suitable for residential mixed use	Comments noted and will be passed onto Parish Council. The Site Allocations document will not allocate land for affordable housing as these sites are delivered as exceptions in accordance

			development including cemetery and village hall.	with Core Strategy policy H4.
S25/019	Cllr Ray Gamble	Land in St Johns	Would not wish to see the loss of any woodland (Bullock Wood) around the Betts Factory. Agrees in principal with the views of Paula Baker S25/002.	Comments noted.
S25/020	Penny Kraft	Sites in Wivenhoe	Accepts that development on land allocated as residential would not be supported by the Council but areas such as 'The Nook' should be allocated as Open Space as outlined in the Wivenhoe Town Plan	Comments noted and the Borough Council will work in partnership with Wivenhoe Town Council and appropriate stakeholders to incorporate appropriate elements of the Town Plan into the LDF.
S25/021	Antoinette Stinson, Wivenhoe Town Council	Sites in Wivenhoe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wivenhoe Town Council would like to see more land made available for allotments and a new cemetery</li> <li>• Raise issues regarding the number of anomalies on the maps and key including the Engine Shed being designated as open space whereas the Nook is considered residential</li> <li>• Wivenhoe Town Council believes the text on page 69 is incorrect and should be deleted from future policy documents.</li> <li>• Conservation Area appraisal has been undertaken and currently waiting formal approval from the Borough Council.</li> <li>• Business Park is designated as residential; this should be an employment area.</li> <li>• Coastal Protection belt needs to be</li> </ul>	<p>Comments Noted and the Borough Council will work in partnership with Wivenhoe Town Council and appropriate stakeholders to incorporate appropriate elements of the Town Plan into the LDF.</p> <p>As a result Wivenhoe Town Council will have opportunity to influence the Site Allocations document prior to the next round of consultation. Mapping errors will be corrected.</p>

S25/022	Adam Wilson	Objects to development on all sites	retained to ensure the gap between Wivenhoe and Colchester is maintained	Officers strive to write to documents in plain English and do not wish to alienate people with language used. The Core Strategy aims to deliver the necessary infrastructure alongside any development.
S25/023	Sarah Burgess, CABE	General	<p>Consultation documents are difficult to read with obscure language. Decent transport links are needed to support all new developments. Colchester is locked with traffic and there has been a high loss of green sites. The Council should just drop the pretence and be honest about which areas are being dug up.</p> <p>Due to limited resources, CABE are unable to comment on the document. They do however make some general comments regarding design and is role in national and regional policy and links to appropriate CABE guidance.</p>	Comments noted and will be fed into the Development Policies DPD.
S25/025	Amy Carter, East Donyland Parish Council	Rowhedge Port	<p>Parish Council are pleased to see their comments regarding flooding problems have been endorsed and the only area earmarked for development is the Port area. Difficulties with the key and the maps being smaller than the Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of maps and key needs to be improved</li> <li>Green corridors need to be wider to fulfil their biodiversity function.</li> <li>Wivenhoe Business Park near Brook Street should be employment land.</li> <li>Areas that do not form retail centre could be considered for mixed use to help protect employment in Wivenhoe.</li> </ul>	Officers appreciate the difficulties many people faced with regards to the key and the maps contained within the document. These issues will be rectified before the next round of consultation.
S25/026	Chris Fox	Wivenhoe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of maps and key needs to be improved</li> <li>Green corridors need to be wider to fulfil their biodiversity function.</li> <li>Wivenhoe Business Park near Brook Street should be employment land.</li> <li>Areas that do not form retail centre could be considered for mixed use to help protect employment in Wivenhoe.</li> </ul>	Comments noted. Officers appreciate the difficulties with the maps and will rectify these issues prior to the next round of consultation through partnership working with Wivenhoe Town Council and appropriate stakeholders to address issues raised during this round of consultation.

S25/027	Amy Carter, Eight Ash Green Parish Council	Eight Ash Green	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wivenhoe Conservation Area should be extended and text amended to acknowledge appraisal work that is being undertaken.</li> <li>Designation near Broadfields sport ground needs to be clarified.</li> <li>Clarification sought over land which appears to be residential but is outside of settlement boundary</li> </ul>	<p>All parish councils will be invited to provide assistance in the work the Borough Council is undertaking on the village envelopes. The creation of a VDS and Parish Plan will also assist this work and is likely to be adopted by the Borough Council following its completion as outlined in the Core Strategy.</p>
S25/028	Paul Matthews	S106 – Peldon	<p>Eight Ash Green PC in broad support of the Site Allocations document and confirm their objection to the allocation of any further sites within the parish. Parish council has a long held view that any future developments should aim to retain the rural nature of the village and be towards the centre of the communities as opposed to the periphery. Parish council would welcome opportunity to be involved in review of existing village envelope and have successfully established a group of volunteers to prepare a VDS and Parish Plan.</p> <p>Extremely anxious that site S106 as identified following the Issues and Options consultation is not developed. Peldon has limited infrastructure to support future development.</p>	<p>S106 is outside of the existing Peldon village envelope and therefore there is a presumption against new development. In addition landscape issues such as the existing Tree Preservation Order will add weight to that presumption.</p> <p>The Borough Council is aware of the recent village survey and is working with the Parish on a Village Design Statement.</p>
S25/029	Frances Fergus	Sites in Peldon	<p>Relieved to see that no sites in Peldon have been supported at this stage, but remain concerned that they could be</p>	

			<p>suitable as Rural Exception Sites. Central area of Peldon is important for the local wildlife and biodiversity of the area and a recent village survey demonstrated the importance of this area to local residents. Peldon is a small non sustainable village lacking in services and has a limited bus service and therefore can not cope with any future development. The countryside should be protected for environmental reasons outlined.</p>	<p>There is a general presumption against new development outside village envelopes. Any development on a rural exception site will have to take into account local need for affordable housing, the local environment and character of the area such as existing Tree Preservation Orders. Winstred Hundred Parish Council does not deem it necessary to change the existing village envelope as outlined in Chapter 5 of the Site Allocations document.</p>
S25/030	Alex and Margaret McArthur	Sites in Peldon	<p>Pleased to see no changes proposed to the Peldon village envelope although are concerned that some sites may be suitable for affordable housing. Any future development should be within the existing village envelope. Peldon is lacking in village amenities and Mersea Road poses highway safety issues.</p>	<p>The Borough Council is aware of the recent village survey and is working with the Parish on a Village Design Statement. There is a general presumption against new development outside village envelopes. Any development on a rural exception site will have to take into account local affordable housing need, the local environment and character of the area such as existing Tree Preservation Order. Winstred Hundred Parish Council does not deem it necessary to change the existing village envelope as outlined in Chapter 5 of the Site Allocations document.</p>
S25/031	Mr P Egan	Alternative Sites 1, 9 and 11	<p>Oppose any development on these sites and support the Council's position.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
S25/032	Mr M Knowles	Appendix 4 and 5 and Scheduled Ancient	<p>Scheduled Ancient Monument 5729455 Gosbecks Iron Age and Roman Settlements. The area of the allocation is</p>	<p>The Borough Council invites English Heritage to comment on all LDF documents which are out for public</p>

S25/033	Cllr Martin Goss	Sites in Mile End Ward and North Colchester	Monuments	under review by English Heritage and may well change in the future.  Residents on North Colchester do not welcome the development proposed. The area lacks appropriate community facilities and open space. Roads and supporting infrastructure need to be provided first because there is complete grid lock currently. The ridiculous amount of housing required needs to be reduced to stop building slums of the future.  A site for future housing development is put forward for consideration in the Site Allocations.	consultation. In the next consultation document the Borough Council will use the most up to date information available.  The Core Strategy identifies the level of growth for North Colchester which is to be delivered through a comprehensive Master Plan which will seek to provide improved community facilities and open space provision. The Core Strategy also outlines the infrastructure requirements that are expected to be delivered alongside future developments.  The site is adjacent to the existing settlement boundary of Tiptree and therefore only considered suitable for affordable housing. Site would have been put into Appendix 3a had it been submitted during the Issues and Options consultation
S25/034	Mark Archer	Site at Simpsons Lane, Tiptree			Comments noted. Any future allocation of land will need to be based on policies in the Development Policies DPD, Core Strategy or appropriate national or regional policies. Officers will ensure that justifications given for any sites are based on sound policies and best practice guidance.
S25/035	Malcolm Inkster, Tendring District Council	General comment		The Site Allocations DPD proposes a number of rural employment sites. The explanations for these refer to Rural Employment Sites but TDC have been unable to find the companion term in either the Core Strategy or Development Policies DPD. Without a link to policy the term offers no guidance.  The Core Strategy identifies Urban District Centres in accordance with PPS6. The designation will provide greater scope to foster a more viable and sustainable future for the retail park without competing	Comments noted. The Core Strategy outlines the general principles and uses expected for each area. Alongside this the emerging Development Policies Document will add further detail to the
S25/036	Neil Waterson, Bidwells on behalf of Glanmore Investments Ltd	Turner Rise, Urban District Centres			



			<p>with the Town Centre alongside the regeneration surrounding the station. PPS6 underlines the need for Local Planning Authorities to consider the network of centres and their relationship in the centres hierarchy. Given the scale of new retail floor space identified in the Core Strategy it is appropriate to consider some retail within the accessible Urban District Centres.</p>	<p>uses which are appropriate within certain areas. Turner Rise is expected to remain an Urban District Centre and will be shown as such again in the next consultation document.</p>
S25/037	Strutt and Parker, on behalf of the Trustees of the Round 1969 Settlement – Noble Fund	Sites S138 Birch, S139 Layer-de-la-Haye and S140 Layer-de-la-Haye	<p>These three sites on the edge of village envelopes should be considered as suitable sites for housing, either on a mix of housing or solely for affordable housing in accordance with Core Strategy Policy H3. Sites are in close proximity to southern growth area and have no site constraints.</p>	<p>These sites were placed into Appendix 3a as they are outside of the existing village envelope(s). Further work is being undertaken by officers regarding the existing village envelopes. There is presumption against new development outside village envelopes but Core Strategy policy H4 supports rural exception sites to meet local need.</p>
S25/038	Andrew Hodgson, Savills on behalf of Essex and Suffolk Water	Essex and Suffolk Water land in Layer-de-la-Haye and Abberton	<p>The sites identified are on land owned by Essex and Suffolk Water which is surplus to operational requirements. Both sites are outside of the existing village envelopes and could help meet the local housing need. Given the existing housing market there should be an element of market housing allowed on rural exception sites, an approach taken in other Essex authorities.</p>	<p>These sites were placed into Appendix 3a as they are outside of the existing village envelope(s). Further work is being undertaken by officers regarding the existing village envelopes. There is presumption against new development outside village envelopes but Core Strategy policy H4 supports rural exception sites to meet local need.</p>
S25/041	Robert McClure, Defence Estates on behalf of MoD	Middlewick Rifle Range and Training Area	<p>Appendix 5 shows Middlewick Rifle Range as a potential open space site. Such a designation would be wholly inappropriate</p>	<p>Officers agree that the Open space allocation is inappropriate and will be removed prior to the next consultation</p>

S25/043	Lee Melin, Bidwells	Legion Playing Field, West Mersea.	as this area is a live firing range. Representation seeks the allocation of part of Legion Field for the development of a GP Surgery. At present there is no other viable or available site in West Mersea.	document. Officers have been involved with this site and will further explore the options and possibilities for creating of new community facilities in West Mersea with appropriate stakeholders.
S25/044	Lee Melin, Bidwells	Land adjacent to Wivenhoe Fire Station	Representation seeks to allocate approximately 1ha of land adjacent to Wivenhoe Fire Station for the development of a GP Surgery. At present there are no other viable or available sites in Wivenhoe.	Officers have been involved with this site and will further explore the options and possibilities for creating of new community facilities in Wivenhoe with appropriate stakeholders.
S25/046	Neil Osborn	Alternative Site 1 – Cymbeline Way	Council has failed to have sufficient regard to the evidence base which indicates the need for additional hotel bedrooms. Development of the site would accord with tourism and employment policies and is on a site free from constraints. The site should be allocated for a 3 star hotel as indicated in the Hotel Demand Study.	The Council clearly set out their position against the development of this site in the evidence base and hearing statements for the Core Strategy and the Council's position has not changed since the Core Strategy Examination. The site has also been subject to a recent planning application that was refused.
S25/047	Nigel Gough, Bigwood Associates Ltd on behalf of Abberton Manor Development Ltd	Abberton Manor, Layer Road, Abberton	Abberton Manor is a registered Nursing Home and close-care apartments as an integrated Care Village. Initial studies have indicated there is a need for specialist Elderly Mental and Infirm care on the site which would enhance the facilities on site. LDF provides an opportunity to establish principle of Care Village with appropriate links to the NHS.	Comments noted regarding the requested changes to the Site Allocations DPD which will be considered during the preparation of the next Site Allocations consultation document. A Community Facilities Audit has also been carried out which will form part of the extensive LDF evidence base and help identify areas of community needs.
S25/048	Captain Ian Crossley, Mersea Island Society	West Mersea	In the summer months the roads around West Mersea are clogged up with parked	Comments noted and Policy DP8 of the Development Policies consultation

S25/050	David Barbour, on behalf of the Barbour Family	Land at Gosbecks Farm S260	cars, the infrastructure to cater for visitor numbers is not in place. More car parks and private open space is needed. Opportunity for a mixed development, open space, considerable landscaping and provision for the continuation of Cunobelin Way this by-passing most of the remainder of Gosbecks Road. Development of this site would be a logical extension to the built up area.	document indicates the Council's position with regard to tourism.  There is no need to allocate additional greenfield sites.
S25/051	Mrs and Mrs Diggle	Sites in Eight Ash Green	Support the exclusion of sites in Eight Ash Green. Some of these areas best examples of arable farmland in the village and contribute to the environment and have been rejected in the past in previous Local Plans and Planning Committees.	Comments noted and at this stage the Borough Council are not proposing any change to the existing village envelope of Eight Ash Green.
S25/052	Mrs and Mrs Diggle	Sites in Eight Ash Green	Support the exclusion of sites in Eight Ash Green. Some of these areas best examples of arable farmland in the village and contribute to the environment and have been rejected in the past in previous Local Plans and Planning Committees.	Comments noted and at this stage the Borough Council are not proposing any change to the existing village envelope of Eight Ash Green.
S25/053	Brian Morgan ADP Ltd	Residential development in rural areas	Express concerns that future residential development in rural areas should reflect acknowledged rural needs and not be seen as a simple development opportunity. It has become self evident that housing growth in villages has not protected or improved local community facilities, nor has this reversed the increasing trend for villages to become dormitories. Believe it is necessary for the	Comments noted and supported. Further work is being undertaken to look at the existing village envelopes which will form part of the evidence base.

				Council to resist expanding village envelopes to accommodate more housing unless there is robust and credible evidence. The Council's recent consultation with Parish Councils has not provided any evidence of rural housing demand which requires the expansion of village envelopes.	
S25/054	Mrs Burwood	Site in Eight Ash Green	Proposed residential site in Eight Ash Green. Similar to S246 submitted as part of the Issues and Options Consultation	Site is outside of the existing village envelope and in Appendix 3a. At this stage no changes are proposed to existing village envelopes.	
S25/055	Cllr Paul Smith	General comment	Object to the proposal to combine public and private open space. Having two designations affords greater protection to sites allocated a public open space	Comments noted.	
S25/056	Andrew Crayston, Fenn Wright	Site S131, Land South of Peldon Common	Site S131 includes former agricultural buildings and is well should be allocated as rural employment	Any rural employment site will have to accord with the policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Development Policies document. The Borough Council will consider this new site against the criteria already in place.	
S25/057	Andrew Crayston, Fenn Wright	Site S134, South of Brierley Hall, West Mersea	Site S134 should be included within the settlement boundary of West Mersea. The site has potential for planned release and mixed use development to be delivered through a design brief	The possible change to the settlement boundary of West Mersea was a question on the representation form and the results of this consultation will influence the future boundary of West Mersea.	
S25/058	J.E. Harris on behalf of Mr B Kinnear	Extension of Marks Tey village envelope	Proposed change to the Marks Tey village envelope to include land near Marks Tey Hall and fronting onto A12 slip road. Current junction causes problems and development in this area could help to pay	This site was put forward as part of the Issues and Options Consultation. At this stage the Council do not have any justification for the extension of the village envelope but are undertaking work on the	

S25/059	Catherine Pollard, Boyer Planning on behalf of Mr Sexton	Crossfield Way, Boxted	for the necessary redesign or the road and turning area. An affordable housing scheme is unlikely to generate the funds needed to address the highway issues.	village envelope which will form part of the evidence base. Highway issues would have to be resolved satisfactorily with Essex County Council as Highways Authority and the Highways Agency. Further work is being undertaken to look at the existing village envelopes which will form part of the evidence base.
S25/060	Catherine Pollard, Boyer Planning on behalf of J.C Contractors	The Mullions, Great Horkesley	Site is approximately 0.12ha and is bound by the existing residential area and primary school which pre-dates the Adopted Local Plan. As such the site has no affinity with the open countryside and is entirely enclosed. Site is enclosed by residential properties and the A12. It represents an appropriate location for a Rural Employment Site with direct access to the A134 and well served by bus services. Allocation of the site for rural employment is requested.	Any rural employment site will have to accord with the policies in the Core Strategy and emerging Development Policies document. The Borough Council will consider this new site against the criteria already in place.
S25/062	Steve Norman	Site S050, Land at Cannock Mill, Old Heath Road	Current Open Space allocation in this area is incorrect. Part of the current allocation forms part of the extensive cartilage of Cannock Mill House and is used as a private garden whilst land to the north and west is public open space. Request change of allocation to reflect the current uses.	Comments noted. As part of the Site Allocations formulation the Borough Council is also looking closely at every existing Local Plan Allocation to see if these are still correct and/or appropriate. Land at Cannock Mill will be looked at as part of this background work.
S25/063	Richard Inman, GO- East	General comments	GO-East does not propose to offer detailed comments on this draft DPD but highlights that the document does not appear to include any additional sites to accommodate the needs of gypsies/travellers and identified in the Core Strategy. Recommend that future	Comments noted. Since the document was printed the Borough Council has received information relating to the gypsy and traveller need within the Borough as a result of the RSS Single Issues Review which was published in December 2008. This document will become part of the

S25/064	Jonathon Hills, Grange Marsh Properties Ltd	Rowhedge Settlement Boundary	documents provide sufficient sites to meet the required needs. Add the boundary of the Rowhedge Port Development Brief onto the Proposals Map and rationalise the south west boundary as shown on map submitted with representation.	evidence base and be fed into the next consultation document. Comments noted and the boundary of the Rowhedge Port Development Brief is likely to be a worthy addition to the proposals map. Work is being undertaken on the settlement boundaries and consultation responses will feed into this work.
S25/065	Helen Harris Myland Parish Council	General comments	<p>1. Document should include an up to date Proposals Map that includes site numbers This would make it easier for those not familiar with the area to understand and avoid the need for extensive referencing to locations.</p> <p>2. Myland Parish Council has identified the need for 2 community centres on land between Mile End Road, Bergholt Road, Nayland Road and Boxted Road. This is in addition to one secured under S.106 agreement for the Severalls Development and included in Severalls Masterplan. The current document only identifies 1 community centre.</p> <p>3. The Parish Council do not support the inclusion of Table 3a in the Site Allocations document</p> <p>4. The Parish Council have requested that Table 3c in the Site Allocation document</p>	<p>1. Sites which were identified previously were not included in the Regulation 25 consultation as this would have made the document unwieldy and was considered to be an unnecessary addition.</p> <p>2. Comments noted and these will be fed into the North Colchester SPD which is anticipated for public consultation autumn 2009. Myland Parish Council are a stakeholder in the preparation of the North Colchester SPD and will continue to be involved as the document develops further.</p> <p>3. This table is unlikely to be repeated in the final Site Allocations document.</p> <p>4. This table is unlikely to be repeated in the final Site Allocations document</p>

S25/065	Helen Harris Myland Parish Council	General	be included in future masterplans for North Colchester	Comments noted
S25/065	Helen Harris Myland Parish Council	Site S180	S129 is land to the north of Coggeshall Road not land to south of Bergholt Road Myland PC proposed that this land was used for either a secondary school or a cemetery while CBC put it forward as a suitable site for Park and Ride. Myland requesting that the site is moved to Appendix 3c on the grounds that CBC are being inconsistent in terms of the future uses of the site.	The principal of a Park and Ride was agreed in the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations document outlines the preferred site. Key facilities and infrastructure to be delivered alongside the North Growth Area are outlined in the Core Strategy and the Borough Council will continue to work with stakeholders and partners to deliver these "necessary" projects.
S25/065	Helen Harris Myland Parish Council	Site S282	Allotments off Norman Way not in Mile End	Comments noted
S25/066	Simon Neate Indigo Planning on behalf of Wharf Land Investments	Rowhedge Port	Request made that the Rowhedge Port site be carried forward in the Site Allocations process as it can accommodate 300 houses and help contribute to the Borough's housing targets.  Objection raised that the Site Allocation document recommends that the site be retained for employment as this conflicts with CBC's aspirations in relation to the redevelopment of the site. Request that the site is taken forward as a Regeneration Area	The next consultation document will have to take into account any recent planning applications as well as the aims and objectives of the adopted development brief for Rowhedge Port. The employment allocation will be corrected.
S25/068	Atisreal	Colne Bank	Atisreal is supportive of the removal of the	Comments noted. CBC will be looking in

		House, St Peter's Street, Castle Ward	Local Plan Employment allocation on Colne Bank House and its presentation in the Site Allocations as white land. Atistreal whilst supportive that the employment allocation has been removed they suggest that emerging policy needs to go further than Local Plan EMP1 to enable and guide the re development of this site for mix use developments that would be compatible in this predominantly residential area.	detail at St Peters Street prior to finalising Site Allocations in view of the recent planning permissions and its proximity to the Town Centre and North Station Regeneration Area.
S25/069	Environment Agency	General	The EA re-emphasised the importance of applying the Sequential approach particularly in East Colchester where there are known Flood Risk issues. In this area more vulnerable development such as Housing should be set back from the river frontage with less vulnerable development i.e. commercial, offices or retail located between the residential and river frontage.	The Borough Council will continue to work with EA to ensure any future development in the Borough satisfies their concerns.
S25/070	Simon Plater, Plater Claiborne Architecture and Design	Site S247, Eight Ash Green	The site should be considered for allocation as an extension to the Eight Ash Green village envelope because it is surrounded on three sides by existing housing, fronts a dual carriageway and is in a sustainable location.	This site was included in Appendix 3a of the Regulation 25 consultation as a site outside the existing village envelope. Further work is being undertaken with regards to the village envelopes which will become part of the evidence base.
S25/071	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Messrs M&M Parmenter	Site S156, Salcott	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in that work. The



S25/072	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr Beales	Site S166, Land off Berechurch Hall Road	<p>if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements. The proposed site could provide a cluster of new housing for the village along with some car parking for the church which is opposite and contribute towards the Core Strategy Other Villages Housing Target of 435.</p> <p>Site Allocations document does not undertake a systematic and comprehensive review of settlement boundaries to define the settlement boundary of Colchester as outlined in the Core Strategy Inspector's Report. The proposed site is on the periphery of a Key Centre for Growth and is closely located to a range of community services, public transport and the town centre.</p>	<p>resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.</p>
S25/073	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr S Brown	Site S157, Layer-de-la-Haye	<p>Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements. Layer-de-la-Haye was recognised as a Principal Village in the previous Local Plan's with a good level of services and facilities and this is still the case although there is no longer a settlement classification or Hierarchy for villages in the Core Strategy. Site could provide 3</p>	<p>A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.</p>

S25/074	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr D Miller	Land adjacent to Ramparts Farm, Bakers Lane, Braiswick, Colchester	dwelling which would supplement the housing targets for the villages. Site Allocations document does not undertake a systematic and comprehensive review of settlement boundaries to define the settlement boundary of Colchester as outlined in the Core Strategy Inspector's Report. The site on the periphery of a Key Service Centre will feature highly in any sequential approach to future development. Alongside residential development of the site (up to 5 units) it is proposed to extend West Wood to Bakers Lane to increase the attractiveness of the Colne Valley.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S25/075	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of NWT Distribution Ltd	Site at Rowhedge Wharf	Site Allocations document does not undertake a systematic and comprehensive review of settlement boundaries to define the settlement boundary of Colchester as outlined in the Core Strategy Inspector's Report. The site is brownfield land and is largely vacant having formerly been in active commercial use and is visually unattractive from the High Street. A transport assessment indicates that development of the site is technically feasible.	The site is included within the draft settlement boundary for Rowhedge as shown in Appendix 9 of the Site Allocations document. This area of Rowhedge is subject to a development brief which has been adopted by the Council. Any future development of this site is expected to accord with the adopted development brief as well as appropriate Core Strategy, Regional and National Policies.
S25/076	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr D Clough	Site S158, Land at Bull Lane, Tiptree	Site Allocations document does not undertake a systematic and comprehensive review of settlement boundaries to define the settlement	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an

			<p>boundary of Colchester as outlined in the Core Strategy Inspector's Report. Tiptree is the second largest settlement in Colchester Borough Council and has its own secondary school and a high level of community services and facilities. Site is bound by existing residential areas and could provide approximately 90 dwellings of the housing target outlined in the Core Strategy for Tiptree.</p>	<p>important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.</p>
S25/077	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Messrs Jones & Whymark	Site S152, Land off Spring Lane, Wivenhoe	<p>Site Allocations document does not undertake a systematic and comprehensive review of settlement boundaries to define the settlement boundary of Wivenhoe as outlined in the Core Strategy Inspector's Report. The site is currently Open Space in the Local Plan but there has been no approach by CBC to acquire the land for such purpose. The site could accommodate approximately 3 units and assist towards the housing targets as outlined in the Core Strategy</p>	<p>A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map..</p>
S25/078	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Colchester Golf Club	Site S162, Land adjacent to Colchester Golf Club	<p>Site Allocations document does not undertake a systematic and comprehensive review of settlement boundaries to define the settlement boundary of Colchester as outlined in the Core Strategy Inspector's Report. The draft Proposals Map shows the site as white land sandwiched between areas of residential and open space (associated</p>	<p>A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map. The Golf Club are involved in the</p>

			<p>with the golf course). As such the site is landlocked and cannot be regarded as open countryside or of any realistic alternative use for agriculture. The site on the periphery of the Growth Area is close to services and facilities and could accommodate approximately 5 units towards the Core Strategy housing targets.</p>	<p>preparation of the master plan for the North Growth Area.</p>
S25/079	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr French	Site S155, Land off Motts Lane, Marks Tey	<p>Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements. Marks Tey was recognised as a Principal Village in the previous Local Plan's with a good level of services and facilities and this is still the case although there is no longer a settlement classification or Hierarchy for villages in the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.</p>
S25/080	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr Martin	Site S160, Land at Peaks Farm, Tiptree	<p>Site Allocations document does not undertake a systematic and comprehensive review of settlement boundaries to define the settlement boundary of Tiptree as outlined in the Core Strategy Inspector's Report. Tiptree is the second largest settlement in Colchester Borough Council and has its own secondary school and a high level of community services and facilities. Site is</p>	<p>A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.</p>

S25/081	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr Firth	Site S165, Land at Fingringhoe	bound by existing residential areas and could provide approximately 140 dwellings (including affordable units) of the housing target outlined in the Core Strategy for Tiptree. Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S25/082	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr Davidson	Site S164, Brickhouse Farm, Peldon	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements. Development of this site could provide opportunity for a mixed use scheme incorporating a village shop, further community uses and indoor sport and recreational facilities in an existing modern barn. Affordable housing could also be delivered 'on or off' site as part of the scheme.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S25/083	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr & Mrs Sutton	Site S292, Land at Appletrees, Messing	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an

S25/085	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Powerplus Engineering Ltd and Whitnell Contracts Ltd	School Farm Buildings, School Road, Langham	This site has not been subject to previous land bids to the council and is an established commercial site with two successful local companies operating from it. Land bid includes existing buildings and adjoining agricultural land to enable the businesses to expand if necessary in the future. Land should be allocated as a Local Employment Zone in line with Core Strategy Table CE1a and PPS7.	village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements.	important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map. As this site has not been put forward previously the Council has not considered it to date in the Site Allocations process. Following this consultation period the site will be considered for the suggested use by using the same methodology that has been outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document.
S25/086	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr Whitnell	Ruby's Barn, Contractors Depot, Ipswich Road, Dedham	The site has not been subject to previous land bids to the council and has operated as a sui generis use Contractor's Depot since 1977. Site is suitable for allocation as a Local Employment Zone in line with Core Strategy Table CE1a for B1 uses		As this site has not been put forward previously the Council has not considered it to date in the Site Allocations process. Following this consultation period the site will be considered for the suggested use by using the same methodology that has been outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document.
S25/087	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr G Wallace	30a Straight Road, Boxted	The site has not been subject to previous land bids to the council and is an established commercial site known as the Classic Pot Emporium. The site is suitable for allocation as a Local Employment Zone in line with Core Strategy Table CE1a. The Boxted Straight Road, Special Policy Area is being saved from the Local Plan but these		As this site has not been put forward previously the Council has not considered it to date in the Site Allocations process. Following this consultation period the site will be considered for the suggested use by using the same methodology that has been outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document.

S25/088	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr M Cowan	Poplar Nurseries, Marks Tey	place restrictions on the future use of the site. Reallocating the site as a Local Employment Zone would strengthen the Council's position when faced with unauthorised development. Allocation of Poplar Nurseries as a Local Employment Zone. The site provides employment to approximately 50 people and is currently an active garden centre which would remain as the anchor business within the Local Employment Zone. Continuing the current business uses and introducing small number of B1/B2 uses would be in line with the Core Strategy Table CE1a and PPS7.	Previous site representations sought residential use on the site but as this representation is seeking Local Employment Uses the Council has not considered it to date in the Site Allocations process. Following this consultation period the site will be considered for the suggested use by using the same methodology that has been outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document.
S25/089	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr and Mrs Trollope	Site S154, Fingringhoe	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S25/090	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Poplar Nurseries	Site S085 and S163, Marks Tey	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements. Marks Tey was a principal village in the	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map. The

S25/091	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr and Mrs Crowley	Site in Eight Ash Green – Fordham Heath Village Envelope.	Local Plan and many of the services and facilities are still in place. The Site Allocations document does not indicate how the 70 dwellings for Marks Tey as identified in the Core Strategy are to be distributed. Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements.	Housing Trajectory and the Schedule of Small Sites which were part of the Core Strategy Evidence Base (CBC/EB/106) outline how some of the dwellings earmarked for Marks Tey in the Core Strategy are to be delivered. A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S25/092	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr D White	Site in Wakes Colne and changes to the Village Envelope	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S25/093	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of Mr L Whitnell	Changes to Langham St Margaret's Cross Village Envelope	Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S25/094	Edward Gittins & Associates on behalf of	Land in West Bergholt.	A larger site was put forward previously but this representation is for a smaller site	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of



	NEEB Holdings Ltd	Maltings Park and Armoury Road.	with residential uses. Site Allocations document does not undertake systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes as indicated by Core Strategy Policy ENV2. Review of village envelopes will ensure a continuing if limited reservoir of housing land is maintained within smaller settlements.	settlement boundaries is underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S25/095	Edward Gittins & Associates	General	The Core Strategy Inspector's Report indicated that a review of settlement boundaries was to be undertaken as part of the Site Allocations document. This has not been done and is a grave omission from the Regulation 25 consultation document. The methodology is puzzling and is a direct contradiction to the commitment in the Inspector's report to review the settlement boundaries and is seriously flawed. Consultation with town and parish council's does not constitute a review of settlement boundaries, nor does it justify an embargo on site allocations outside of settlement boundaries. The Sustainability Appraisal Revised Scoping Report is flawed as it has ignored the need to undertake the required review of settlement boundaries and which is directly prejudicial to the interest of good planning and the right to have sites properly evaluated. Specific land uses are not outlined in the Growth Areas or the Regeneration Areas, neighbouring	<p>A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>The Council has adopted various Master Plans to guide the future development of various Regeneration Areas which outline the appropriate land uses. The Growth Areas will be delivered through Supplementary Planning Documents which will be subject to extensive public consultation and in accordance with the Core Strategy and other LDF documents. The Core Strategy outlines the facilities which are expected to be delivered as part of the Growth Areas and the Regeneration Areas.</p> <p>The Borough Council have noted</p>

			<p>residents do not know what will be built next to them as the balance between various uses is not elaborated. No quantitative information regarding open space allocations in these areas – it would be useful to have some detail provided to explain and justify the future land uses envisaged. Opportunity still remains to address glaring defects before the Site Allocations Examination in Public.</p>	<p>concerns addressed regarding the methodology and Sustainability Appraisal.</p>
S25/096	Essex County Council	General	<p>The County Council do not support formally designating School Playing Fields as Open Space. A more flexible policy approach is needed because over time there will be a need to review school capacity and reorganise the distribution of local school provision. This may require the sale of surplus school land from time to time. Furthermore the loss of primary schools must be agreed by the Secretary of State therefore such sites already enjoy reasonable protection. ECC have suggested that designating school playing fields for Community Use or Education Use would be more appropriate however they have added a caveat that any such allocation should be accompanied by suitable wording to ensure that such land can be released if suitable adequate services are provided to the local population as proposed in DP3</p>	<p>This issue will be considered further prior to publication of the Site Allocations DPD.</p>
S25/096	Essex County Council	General		<p>Comments noted.</p>

S25/096	Essex County Council	General	<p>Council's proposal to locate a secondary school on land north of the A12 because of the geographical dislocation from the local community it would be provided to serve.</p> <p>ECC proposed the addition of the following wording on page 76 under Essex County Plans 'Essex County Council Childcare Sufficiency Assessment'.</p> <p>Glossary to be re-worded to read Transit Corridor: Colchester's rapid transit corridor will enable buses and coaches to bypass traffic congestions and..... These corridors may also provide quality walking and cycling paths.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted and proposed wording will be incorporated.</p>
S25/097	Hills Residential	General	<p>Fiveways Fruit Farm covers a total area of 31.9ha. Of this total 14.9ha to the south is under option for a quarry extension. Changing economic conditions means farm no longer viable and site put forward for residential development. Proposal includes an extension to the boundary of the Stanway Growth Area between Dyers Road and Heath Road to include the residual 16.3 ha of land at Fiveways Fruit Farm. This would reconcile the settlement boundary and Proposals map and provide sufficient land for residential development close to existing services and facilities at Stanway. These two areas would deliver the housing requirements for Stanway Growth Area as identified in the Core</p>	<p>Further work is being undertaken with regards to the village envelopes and settlement boundaries which will become part of the evidence base and support the next consultation document.</p> <p>The Core Strategy outlines the facilities which are expected to be delivered as part of the Growth Areas and the Regeneration Areas.</p> <p>Areas of land for future quarry uses will be identified in the Minerals LDF which Essex County Council are currently preparing and amendments will be made to the Proposals Map.</p>

S25/098	Hills Residential Ltd.	Site S001, Dedham	<p>Strategy. Locating housing on both sides of Dyers Road represents a sustainable strategy for housing provision. Hills Residential are also requesting that the southern 14.8ha of the farm be excluded from the Growth Area and placed within the area 'safeguarded for future quarry use' proposed within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Site S001 currently falls outside existing settlement boundary of Dedham and in the current Site Allocation document it is listed in Appendix 3b as a site potentially suitable for affordable housing. The site should be considered as an alternative site for Local Housing for Local People (including a mix of 40% affordable housing and smaller open market housing catering for the over 55 age group who wish to move within Dedham) because of its location. The Farm buildings are currently redundant and no longer viable. Including S001 would create a logical and defensible settlement boundary by creating an infill between existing houses and the doctors surgery.</p>	<p>A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.</p>
S25/099	Highways Agency	Objection to future developments in Marks Tey / Eight Ash Green	<p>The Highways Agency reiterated the objections raised in previous consultations about more development around Marks Tey/Eight Ash Green. Any major development at this location would require the creation of a new community and at</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

			<p>this stage they do not feel that there is adequate justification during the current plan period. Marks Tey offers public poor transport opportunities compared to the Core Strategy approach. Also Marks Tey Junction 25 roundabout already at capacity. Cumulative development around Eight Ash Green/ Marks Tey would have major impact on the A12 truck road. Both junctions are currently over capacity and additional trips would put them under severe pressure.</p>	
S25/099	Highways Agency	Objection	<p><u>Growth Areas</u> – The sites proposed in the Reg 25 consultation are consistent with Growth Areas identified however they fall short of identifying the full extent of the growth required e.g. 1600 homes proposed for Tiptree, Wivenhoe and West Mersea but only one major allocation has been proposed at Grange Road Tiptree which can accommodate 800 dwellings. How will 800 houses shortfall be accommodated? Also no sites have been identified that will contribute 2000 dwellings, 67,000sqm of retail floorspace or 40,000sqm office space in Town Centre, Highways Agency would strongly support such sites given their inherent sustainability.</p>	<p>The housing trajectory and employment land study which was submitted as part of the Core Strategy Examination in Public outlines a wide range of sites which will deliver the housing and employment targets. Local Plan allocations which have been carried forward will provide a large proportion of the targets. The figures also include a large number of dwellings already built.</p>
S25/099	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative site 1. Cymbeline	<p>HA not supportive of this Alternative site proposal for Business /Hotel use which could potentially have a significant impact</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

S25/099	Highways Agency	Meadows Objection to Alternative Site 2. Choats Corner Eight Ash Green	on the trunk road network. HA still not supportive of the proposal for residential development on this site which could potentially have a significant impact on the trunk road network.	Comments noted and supported. The site will not be taken forward in the Site Allocations DPD.
S25/099	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative sites A-D at Langham	Sites not supported by HA for mixed use development due to potentially major impact on trunk road network.	CBC supports HA comments. Large number of representations received in response to these site proposals at Core Strategy Regulation 32 stage. CBC still considers sites as inappropriate as they fall outside village envelopes. Park and Ride proposals also considered inappropriate. CBC do not support this proposal as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site Allocations DPD.
S25/099	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative Site 4. Braiswick	HA not supportive of residential development at this site despite potential minor impacts on the trunk road network.	CBC do not support this proposal either as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site Allocations DPD.
S25/099	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative Site 5. Marks Tey and Stanway.	HA not supportive of mixed use development at either Eight Ash Green (J26) or Marks Tey interchange (J25) due to potentially major impacts on the trunk road network	CBC do not support this proposal either as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site Allocations DPD.
S25/099	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative Site 6. Marks Tey Stanway	HA not supportive of mixed use development at either Eight Ash Green (J26) or Marks Tey interchange (J25) due to potentially major impacts on the trunk	CBC do not support this proposal either as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site

			road network	Allocations DPD.
S25/099	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative Site 7. Marks Tey	HA maintaining objection to mixed use development at this site due its potentially major impact on the trunk road network.	CBC do not support this proposal either as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site Allocations DPD.
S25/099	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative Site 9. Spring Lane	HA maintaining objection to proposed park and Ride at Spring Land and have identified potentially major impacts on the trunk road network.	CBC do not support this proposal either as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site Allocations DPD.
S25/099	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative Site 10. Halstead Road.	HA maintaining objection to residential development due to potentially major impacts on the trunk road network.	CBC do not support this proposal either as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site Allocations DPD.
S25/099	Highways Agency	Objection to Alternative Site 11. Chitts Hill	HA maintaining objection to proposed residential development due to its potentially significant impact on the trunk road network.	CBC do not support this proposal either as outlined in the Core Strategy Hearing Statements and this allocation will not be taken forward as part of the Site Allocations DPD.
S25/291	Natalie Wells Gladedale Special Projects Division c/o Barton Wilmore	Objection to exclusion of Alternative Site 11 Chitts Hill and settlement boundary shown for Colchester	Objection raised about the exclusion of this site at Chitts Hill in the Site Allocations document. The site is in conformity with PPS3 as it is available for development, is a greenfield site located close to existing housing, facilities and services and that the development of the site is achievable. Site should be considered as a viable alternative site. Strong objection raised to the proposed settlement boundary for Colchester.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.

			<p>Proposal made for the boundary to follow the railway line to the north as this is a natural settlement edge to Colchester . Disagree with findings of the Sustainability Appraisal which concluded that development at this site would fail to promote regeneration, be unlikely to benefit from existing facilities, would increase pollution and greenhouse gas emissions and set a precedent for development in the countryside north of the A12. Deliverability in the current economic climate is potentially an issue where there is a reliance on one or two large developers to bring sites forward on PDL within growth areas as this approach makes the housing land supply fragile. Chitts Hill is located on the urban edge of Colchester. If the Railway Sidings currently allocated for residential development are developed, the Chitts Hill site will be surrounded on 3 sides by urban development and the railway track on the fourth side. This would round off the settlement boundary if developed. Provides opportunities to provide sustainable cycle and pedestrian links and improves public transport opportunities. Gladedale have suggested a number of changes to the Site Allocations DPD in relation to the Chitts Hill Alternative Site</p>	
S25/292	Nathaniel Lichfield and	General/support	The inclusion of this site alongside other	Comments noted.



			<p>sites proposed for mixed use development close to the Gas Depot e.g. Albany Gardens, Kind Edward Quay offers a holistic approach to developing this part of the Colne Harbour Regeneration Area. The land is contaminated and will require remediation which will incur significant costs.</p> <p>Support for CBC's approach to promote the development of contaminated land. Inclusion of this site helps meet strategic housing targets and regeneration priorities for East Colchester.</p>	
	<p>for inclusion of Hythe Quay Gas Depot for residential led mixed use development.</p>		<p>Objection raised about the identification of land on Colchester Road, Tiptree within the Reg 25 Site Allocations DPD as open space. Request that this land be shown as white land as it currently is in the Local Plan and amendments made to Appendix 7 to reflect this change. Allocation of site as open land could inhibit TFC aspirations for the site. Discussions already held with CBC and ECC however there are unresolved vehicular and pedestrian access issues.</p>	<p>Comments noted and further work will be conducted with colleagues in Leisure Services to consider the future allocation of this site. As outlined discussions have taken place previously between the landowner and the Council and these may well continue in the future to agree the future use of this site and an appropriate allocation to be shown on the Proposals Map which will support the Site Allocations document.</p>
Partners	<p>David Poole Andrew Martin Associates on behalf of Tiptree United Football club</p>	<p>Site off Colchester Road, Tiptree.</p>	<p>Queried the omission of S072 in the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Quarry extension at Fiveways Orchard shown in Minerals Development Framework is not shown in the Site Allocations DPD.</p>	<p>The Sustainability Scoping Report did not support the allocation of this land as the sustainability of S072 is reliant on the development of the larger site S070 to the north. Development of the larger S070 site would bring this land into the Stanway built up area and new residents would</p>
S25/294				
S25/295	<p>Cllr Lesley Scott - Boutell</p>	<p>General</p>		

S25/296	Cllr Gerard Oxford	General	<p>Request for family houses - semi detached or detached rather than large terraces.</p>	<p>benefit from sustainable transport links. A failure to develop S070 however would leave S072 detached from Stanway and car dependence would not reduce. The limited size of the site would fail to deliver a range of facilities needed to meet community needs.</p> <p>Amendments will be made to the Proposals Map to ensure consistency with the Minerals Plan.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Policy H3 and Table H3a identifies the need to provide a range and diversity of housing styles and tenures</p>
			<p>3b sites in Site Allocations DPD</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 70 – currently open space area that needs to be retained due to below average provision in this ward.</li> <li>2. 649 - currently open space area that needs to be retained due to below average provision in this ward.</li> <li>3. 650 listed as derelict but it is Essex County Council's Youth Centre.</li> <li>4. 651 – narrow roadside verge with protect trees along them therefore totally unsuitable for development.</li> <li>5. 652 - narrow roadside verge with protect trees along them therefore totally unsuitable for development.</li> </ol>	<p>Comments noted and open space allocations will be informed in part by work with colleagues in Leisure Services and also the PPG17 study which is part of the extensive LDF evidence base. There is no intention to develop these areas of open space.</p> <p>The lack of sites for future travellers has been identified by GO-East and this omission will be rectified prior to the next round of consultation. The results of the East of England Single Issue Review were only published once the Site Allocations document was printed and therefore officers were unable to feed</p>

S25/298	David Miller Hanover Bloc	London Road, Copford Place	<p>No allocations for future travellers sites despite regional need identified for at least two sites. Important to identify sites as Severalls Lane still not in compliance with planning conditions preventing development moving forward. CBC unlikely to remove conditions holding up development.</p> <p>The maximum parking standards adopted some years ago have been an abysmal failure and created nightmare problems in certain areas of the Borough</p>	<p>these findings into the current consultation document.</p> <p>The County Council are currently preparing guidance on Parking Standards and it is expected to be finalised prior to the next round of LDF consultation.</p>
			<p>Request that this land is included in the existing Copford settlement boundary and the site allocated for the purposes of a Continuing Care Retirement Community in the Submission Site Allocations DPD. There is currently an inherent lack of CCRC facilities within the Borough. The inclusion of this site would 'round off' the settlement boundary in the north east corner of Copford (London Road). Developing this facility in the Borough frees up under occupied larger family homes as older people would relocate to this type of facility.</p> <p>The site should be supported as it</p>	<p>Comments noted regarding the requested changes to the Site Allocations DPD which will be considered during the preparation of the next Site Allocations consultation document. Further work is being undertaken with regards to the settlement boundary which will become part of the evidence base.</p> <p>A Community Facilities Audit has also been carried out which will form part of the extensive LDF evidence base and help identify areas of community needs.</p>

				includes brownfield land on the London Road frontage and rough meadow to the rear. Its inclusion in the village envelope would not impact negatively on the setting of Copford. Nor would it encroach into the strategic gap between Copford and Stanway.	
S25/300	Mr Graham, Coast Road Association	Additional car parking in West Mersea	Previous Local Plans have stressed the lack of car parking in West Mersea and therefore additional car parking should be allocated. A "northern approach" to West Mersea waterfront deserves examination through the LDF.	Comments noted- any future car parking and transport infrastructure will be discussed with Essex County Council.	
S25/301	Ian Thurgood, Wilkin & Sons Ltd	Land to the East of Factory Hill, Tiptree	Site is currently shown as white land on the Local Plan Proposals Map. Reallocation of the land for residential purposes would ensure the continued presence and development of Tiptree Jam Factory. Adjacent woodland could be passed over for community use and ownership	Site will be assessed against the methodology as outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document. If this site was developed it would change the Tiptree settlement boundary as outlined in Appendix 7.	
S25/302	Ian Thurgood, Wilkin & Sons Ltd	International Farm Camp, Land at Hall Road, Tiptree	Existing International Farm Camp is outside of the draft settlement boundary and shown as white land on the Local Plan Proposals Map. Farm Camp to be relocated to adjacent land to meet expanding business needs and the land of the existing Farm Camp to be reallocated as residential.	Site will be assessed against the methodology as outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document. If these changes were supported it would change the Tiptree settlement boundary as outlined in Appendix 7.	
S25/303	Ian Thurgood, Wilkin & Sons Ltd	Reallocation of land at Wilkin & Sons Jam	Change of employment allocation on part of the existing Factory site to residential. Redevelopment of the site will enable	Development of the site would be on previously developed land and contribute towards the brownfield target as outlined	

S25/304	Ian Thurgood, Wilkin & Sons Ltd	Factory	existing factory to relocate and expand which will provide more local jobs.	in the Core Strategy. This would need to be balanced against the loss of employment land. The site will be assessed against the methodology as outlined in the Regulation 25 consultation document. This is new site put forward and will have to be considered during the next stages of the Site Allocations DPD.
S25/306	Neil Osborn, DLP Planning	Alternative Site 3 – Land West of A12, Langham for Park and Ride	Extend the current employment land allocation further South to meet the expanding company needs in response to new legislation and commercial demands. Extension of the factory would retain approximately 200 jobs with 400 additional seasonal jobs which supports the local economy. The site was discussed at the Core Strategy and the Council outlined their position on park and ride facilities. The Council's preferred site at Cuckoo Farm is highly dependent on the funding and delivery of the new A12 junction. The Inspector's report into the Core Strategy encouraged the Borough and County Council's to pursue provision sooner rather than later (para 7.64) and this has not been done. The site at Langham is deliverable and viable and not dependent on the proposed new junction and should be allocated in the Site Allocations document.	The Council clearly set out their position against the development of this site in the evidence base and hearing statements for the Core Strategy. Funding submissions have been made and both the Borough and County Council are confident these will be successful to deliver the preferred location for Park and Ride at Cuckoo Farm. The Council's position on the Langham Park and Ride has not changed since the Core Strategy examination.
S25/309	Andrew Cook, Eight Ash Green Parish Council	General comments	Parish Council has a long held view that future developments should aim to retain rural nature of the village. Parish Council	Comments noted.

			<p>welcomes the exclusion of a number of previously identified major sites on the periphery of the village; however should any rural exception sites come forward these should be towards the geographical centre of the communities. Parish Council would welcome opportunity to be involved in process of looking at village envelopes and has recently set up a group to prepare Village Design Statement and Parish Plan.</p>	
S25/310	Pravin Patel, PPML Consulting Ltd on behalf of Annington Property Limited.	Site off Elmwood Avenue and Littlefield Road, Colchester	<p>Site is currently allocated as open space which is incorrect. Site was occupied by the Ministry of Defence as a nursery school which is surplus to requirements now. The site is previously developed and should not be considered as open space. Site adjoins existing residential areas and is well served to existing services and facilities.</p>	<p>Work is being undertaken to look at the existing Local Plan Allocations which may well identify the current allocation as inaccurate which may result in a proposed change of allocation to better reflect the current situation.</p>
S25/315	Sharon Tyson, Lawson Planning Partnership on behalf of Lanswood Ltd	Alternative Site 9, Land at Spring Lane for Park and Ride	<p>Although the site was not supported at the Core Strategy stage it is important for Park and Ride provision in Colchester to progress with greater urgency. Work undertaken for the Core Strategy has been re-submitted to provide further background at this stage. The site is well located to the principal and trunk road network and would catch incoming traffic from the west and north west of Colchester. Site could provide approximately 660 spaces with necessary</p>	<p>The Council clearly set out their position against the development of this site in the evidence base and hearing statements for the Core Strategy. Funding submissions have been made and both the Borough and County Council are confident these will be successful to deliver the preferred location for Park and Ride at Cuckoo Farm. The Council's position on the Spring Road Park and Ride has not changed since the Core Strategy examination.</p>

S25/316	Sharon Tyson, Lawson Planning Partnership	Land at The Heath, Dedham	landscaping and future land for expansion. Site Allocations document is an opportunity to redress matters and regain the initiative in the development of park and ride facilities for Colchester. Land to the rear of Sundowne, The Heath Dedham represents a suitable location for approximately 35 units including affordable units. The site is currently neglected scrubland and within the cartilage of the dwelling Sundowne. Dedham has a range of services and facilities which make it one of the most sustainable villages in the Borough. Development of this site would represent an opportunity to develop an area of distinct character which would relate to the evolved form of Dedham Heath. The site is discrete, virtually hidden and is acknowledged to have no adverse effect on the AONB.	The site is outside the village envelope. A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S25/317	Mrs B D Eagland	Land in Eight Ash Green	Seek changes to the Eight Ash Green village envelope near Abbotts Lane as the land is surrounded by new developments.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S25/318	Anthony Borges, The Wine Centre	Land in Great Horkesley	Seek changes to the Great Horkesley village envelope near Gardenhurst.	A systematic and comprehensive review of village envelopes and the creation of settlement boundaries un underway. The

S25/319	Joseph Greenhow, Edward Gittins and Associates	General	The Regulation 25 consultation document does not define the Mixed Use Centres and Employment Zone boundaries as outlined in Core Strategy Policies CE1-CE3. New notations for "Employment Zones" and "Proposed Employment Zones" appear instead of Mixed Use Centres and Local Employment Zones as outlined in Table CE1a. Present document is confusing and inconsistent with the Core Strategy and that the omissions/errors should be rectified and document re-drafted for further consultation.	results of this consultation are an important consideration in this work. The resulting evidence will be used to inform the settlement boundaries which will be shown on the Proposals Map.
S25/320	Sue Bull, Anglian Water	General	Completion of the Haven Gateway Water Cycle Study will provide a better understanding of constraints and requirements to service the growth aspirations. Anglian Water also request that no residential development will be within 15 metres of Pumping Stations to prevent any possible odour issues.	Comments noted. The Site Allocations document is intended to accord with the Core Strategy. Any inconsistencies regarding the labelling of allocations will be rectified before the next round of consultation to ensure consistency between all elements of the LDF. Any omissions/errors can be identified and changed accordingly as the document develops further over the coming months.
				Comments noted, the Council expect the Water Cycle Study to be completed and used as part of the extensive LDF evidence base prior to the formal submission of the Site Allocations document.



Our vision is for Colchester to develop as a prestigious regional centre

Our goal is to be a high performing Council

Our corporate objectives for 2006-2009 are:



e-mail: [democratic.services@colchester.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@colchester.gov.uk)  
website: [www.colchester.gov.uk](http://www.colchester.gov.uk)