


Person ID	ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Please specify which section of the Publication Draft Local Plan your comments relate to by choosing one of the following:	Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant?	Do you consider the Local Plan is sound?	If you do not consider the Local Plan is sound, please specify on what grounds:	Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the Duty to Co-operate?	Enter your full representation here	Summary - If your summary is more than 100 words, please provide a brief summary here:	Please specify the changes needed to be made to make the Plan sound/legally compliant:	Do you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination?	Do you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination?	If Yes - you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary	Did you raise the matter that is the subject of your representation with the LPA earlier in the process of the preparation of the Local Plan?	If Yes - which stage?	Do you wish to be notified?	Response to representation - Council's response to representation?	Recommended Change Required?	Categories	Recommended Change Reason	Type	Number	Email Address
1105911	LPPuD77	Rosegrade Limited	Section 2 Tendring	No	No	Consistent with National Policy; Effective; Justified; Positively prepared	Yes	1. Rosegrade are the owners of Thorpe Maltings which they seek, in conjunction with other land, to redevelop for residential purposes. It is important that Emerging Policy does not frustrate this objective. 2. In this regard it is noted the Settlement Development Boundary has been drawn tightly around the existing settlement. However, the 2012 draft Local Plan included within the Settlement Development Boundary an area of land to the north and around the properties known as The Rock, Malting House and Lilac House. It is requested that this land should be reinstated so as to bring it back into the Settlement Development Boundary on the basis that it may be required for residential development to enable the Thorpe Malting development to achieve viability. 3. It is also noted that within the draft Local Plan there was a specific Policy on enabling development (previously policy PPL10) which has now been omitted. There is a section in respect of enabling section which is blank. 4. The removal of the Policy for enabling development is highly undesirable. This Policy is necessary when read together with Policies PPL8 and PPL9 to ensure consistency with National Policy. Without the enabling development Policy, Policies PPL8 and PPL9 are inconsistent with National Policy. Rosegrade therefore seeks two amendments. Firstly, the enlargement of the Settlement Development Boundary for Thorpe Station and Thorpe Maltings and secondly, the reinstatement of Policy PPL 10 "Enabling Development".	Firstly, the enlargement of the Settlement Development Boundary for Thorpe Station and Thorpe Maltings and secondly, the reinstatement of Policy PPL 10 "Enabling Development".	Yes	Yes	to properly represent client	Yes	Preferred Options	When the document is submitted for independent examination?; When the Inspector's Report is published?; When the document is adopted?	The objection concerns a potential development proposal. Although in 2012 the proposed settlement boundary had included an area of land to the north and included three properties, that area of land was removed in 2014.	No	Protected Places; Policies; Maps; Local Maps	Web	7.9				
1105911	LPPuD78	Rosegrade Limited	Section 2 Tendring	No	No	Consistent with National Policy; Effective; Justified; Positively prepared	Yes	1. Rosegrade are the owners of Thorpe Maltings which they seek, in conjunction with other land, to redevelop for residential purposes. It is important that Emerging Policy does not frustrate this objective. 2. In this regard it is noted the Settlement Development Boundary has been drawn tightly around the existing settlement. However, the 2012 draft Local Plan included within the Settlement Development Boundary an area of land to the north and around the properties known as The Rock, Malting House and Lilac House. It is requested that this land should be reinstated so as to bring it back into the Settlement Development Boundary on the basis that it may be required for residential development to enable the Thorpe Malting development to achieve viability. 3. It is also noted that within the draft Local Plan there was a specific Policy on enabling development (previously policy PPL10) which has now been omitted. There is a section in respect of enabling section which is blank. 4. The removal of the Policy for enabling development is highly undesirable. This Policy is necessary when read together with Policies PPL8 and PPL9 to ensure consistency with National Policy. Without the enabling development Policy, Policies PPL8 and PPL9 are inconsistent with National Policy. Rosegrade therefore seeks two amendments. Firstly, the enlargement of the Settlement Development Boundary for Thorpe Station and Thorpe Maltings and secondly, the reinstatement of Policy PPL 10 "Enabling Development".	Firstly, the enlargement of the Settlement Development Boundary for Thorpe Station and Thorpe Maltings and secondly, the reinstatement of Policy PPL 10 "Enabling Development".	Yes	Yes	to properly represent client	Yes	Preferred Options	When the document is submitted for independent examination?; When the Inspector's Report is published?; When the document is adopted?	The objection concerns a potential development proposal. Although in 2012 the proposed settlement boundary had included an area of land to the north and included three properties, that area of land was removed in 2014.	No	Sustainable Places; Policies; Maps; Local Maps	Web	Policy SPL 2				

1105911	LPPuD51 1	Rosegrade de Limited	Section 2 Tendring	Yes	No	Consistent with National Policy; Effective; Justified; Positively prepared	Yes	1. Rosegrade are the owners of Thorpe Maltings which they seek, in conjunction with other land, to redevelop for residential purposes. It is important that Emerging Policy does not frustrate this objective. 2. In this regard it is noted the Settlement Development Boundary has been drawn tightly around the existing settlement. However, the 2012 draft Local Plan included within the Settlement Development Boundary an area of land to the north and around the properties known as The Rock, Malting House and Lilac House. It is requested that this land should be reinstated so as to bring it back into the Settlement Development Boundary on the basis that it may be required for residential development to enable the Thorpe Malting development to achieve viability. 3. It is also noted that within the draft Local Plan there was a specific Policy on enabling development (previously policy PPL10) which has now been omitted. There is a section in respect of enabling section which is blank. 4. The removal of the Policy for enabling development is highly undesirable. This Policy is necessary when read together with Policies PPL8 and PPL9 to ensure consistency with National Policy. Without the enabling development Policy, Policies PPL8 and PPL9 are inconsistent with National Policy. Rosegrade therefore seeks two amendments. Firstly, the enlargement of the Settlement Development Boundary for Thorpe Station and Thorpe Maltings and secondly, the reinstatement of Policy PPL 10 Enabling Development.	Firstly, the enlargement of the Settlement Development Boundary for Thorpe Station and Thorpe Maltings and secondly, the reinstatement of Policy PPL 10 Enabling Development.	Yes	Yes	to properly represent client	Yes	Preferred Options	When the document is submitted for independent examination? When the Inspector's Report is published? When the document is adopted?	Policies Maps; Local Maps	Web	B.26	
---------	--------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	-----	----	---	-----	--	---	-----	-----	------------------------------	-----	-------------------	---	------------------------------------	-----	------	---