





For internal Use only	ID:	Rep No:	

Draft LocalPlan RESPONSE FORM

Responses are encouraged via the council's online consultation system available on the website, see http://tendring-consult.objective.co.uk/portal However, this form can be returned electronically to planning.policy@tendringdc.gov.uk or in hard copy if necessary to:

Planning Policy, Tendring District Council, Thorpe Road, Weeley, Essex, CO16 9AJ The consultation runs from 9am Friday, 16th June to 5pm on Friday, 28th July 2017

This form has two parts:

Part A - Personal Details and Part B - Your comments

Number

1. Personal	Details	2. Agent's Details (if applicable)		
Title		Title	Mr	
First Name		First Name	Peter	
Last Name		Last Name	Le Grys	
Organisation	Geisha, Mallett & Morfo	Organisation	Stanfords	
(Where relevant)		Address Line 1	Livestock Market	
Address Line 1	c/o agent	Address Line 2	Wyncolls Road	
Address Line 2		Address Line 3	Colchester	
Address Line 3		Post Code	CO4 9HU	
Post Code		E-mail Address		
E-mail Address		Teiephone Number		

PART B

REPRESENTATION FORM

Please Note: If your representation relates to Section One of the North Essex Strategic Plan / Garden Communities you only need to respond to one of the Local Authorities. All representations received by Braintree, Colchester and Tendring relating to Section One of the Plan(s) will be submitted together.

You do not need to return this form if you have completed a response using any of the Council's online systems for this consultation. Duplicates will not be considered

systems for this consultation. Duplicates will not be considered
Please specify which section of the Publication Draft Local Plan your comments relate to by choosing one of the following: Section 1 Section 2 Colchester Section 2 Tendring Section 2 Braintree Which part of the section are you responding to? e.g. Paragraph/Policy/Map/Other
e.g. Faragraph/Folicy/Map/Other
Do you consider the Local Plan is Legally compliant? Yes No
Does It comply with the Duty to Co-operate? Yes No
Do you consider the Local Plan Is Sound? Yes No
If you do not consider the Local Plan is sound, please specify on what grounds: Positively prepared Justified Effective Consistent with National Policy
Enter your full representation here:

				1
				(
				1
				- 1
our representation	n le more than 100 wo	rde nlesse provide s	hriof eummary hora-	
our representatio	n is more than 100 wo	rds, please provide a	brief summary here:	
our representatio	n is more than 100 wo	rds, please provide a	brief summary here:	
our representatio	n Is more than 100 wo	rds, please provide a	brief summary here:	
our representatio	n is more than 100 wo	rds, please provide a	brief summary here:	
our representatio	n Is more than 100 wo	rds, please provide a	brief summary here:	
our representatio	n Is more than 100 wo	rds, please provide a	brief summary here:	
our representatio	n Is more than 100 wo	rds, please provide a	brief summary here:	
our representatio	n is more than 100 wo	rds, please provide a	brief summary here:	
our representatio	n is more than 100 wo	rds, please provide a	brief summary here:	
our representatio	n is more than 100 wo	rds, please provide a	brief summary here:	
our representatio	n is more than 100 wo	rds, please provide a	brief summary here:	
our representatio	n is more than 100 wo	rds, please provide a	brief summary here:	
our representatio	n is more than 100 wo	rds, please provide a	brief summary here:	
our representatio	n is more than 100 wo	rds, please provide a	brief summary here:	
our representatio	n is more than 100 wo	rds, please provide a	brief summary here:	

Please specify the changes needed to be made to make the Plan sound / legally compliant
Amend development limits
Do you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination? Yes No
If Yes - you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary
Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.
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 Yes No
If yes which stage Issues and Options Preferred Options
Do you wish to be notified?
When the document is submitted for independent examination?
When the Inspectors Report is published?
When document is adopted?

Braintree & Tendring: Return by 5pm 28th July 2017 (responses to section 2 Braintree and Tendring will not be accepted after this date. After this date responses to Section 1 should be sent to Colchester Borough Council)

Colchester: Return by 5pm 11th August 2017

Michaelstowe Farm, Ramsey Road, Dovercourt

These sites were until 16th June 2017 located within the defined settlement boundary of Dovercourt as identified in the Policies Map of the Tendring District Local Plan: Preferred Options Consultation (2016).



Preferred Options 2016

The sites have been omitted from the plan without any indication to the land owners or other interested parties. The Council has failed to communicate the reason for the deletion of the land. There are no apparent restrictions or limitations upon the land which would justify such a *volte face*. The site is within a sustainable location with a full range of services available within walking distance. The site is also in close proximity to bus stops with access to Dovercourt town centre. On the basis of the above, it is considered that the application site is within a location where future occupiers would have access to local community facilities as well as access to employment opportunities through public transport links. The site is therefore considered sustainable and in accordance with Policy SP1 and Government guidance as contained within the NPPF.

In the absence of any approach by the Council, it can only be surmised that the deletion of the overall site follows an appeal decision for the land opposite St Michael's Church and adjacent to the Two Villages school. If this is the case, it is considered that the authority has failed to properly examine the merits of the site. The original allocation affects three separate and distinct parcels of land. This representation concerns land forming part of a current application

17/00782/OUT and land immediately to the west which has a separate and independent means of access on to Mayes Lane. It does not include the land on the corner of Ramsey Road and Mayes Lane, which is in separate ownership. The land at the junction with Mayes lane has a direct relationship to the church, similar to that identified by the Inspector when considering proposals for the Church Hill site.

The distinction between the three parcels of land was identified within a report prepared on behalf of the Council in 2010. This Landscape Impact Assessment prepared by AMEC demonstrated that the land subject of this representation could be developed without causing any impact upon the wider locality. The site is also some distance and out of view from the church.

It is therefore considered that the Council's response to deleting the entire site allocation is unjustified, and fails to have appropriate regard to the character and nature of the site. The departure from the previous plans in 2012, 2014 and 2016 in irrational and unreasonable.

The scheme would meet the comments set out within paragraph 14 of the NPPF in respect of a positive opportunity to meet the development needs of the area. Moreover, the allocation of this site would accord with the core planning principles as set out within paragraph 17 by ensuring the scheme enhances and improves the place in which people live their lives. The proposal is not only sustainable, it is deliverable as required by paragraphs 47 & 49 of the NPPF.

This representation also raises an objection to the inclusion of suggested site SAH2 for land in Low Road, Dovercourt having regard to the scale and impact of the proposals upon an area otherwise open with extensive views to the south. The development of the land subject of thuis representation is considered to be considerably more appropriate in both scale and relationship to the existing built form of the area.