



For internal Use only	ID:	Rep No:	

Draft Local Plan 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

PART A

1. Personal Details

Title

First Name

Last Name

Organisation *(Where relevant)*

Address Line 1

Address Line 2

Address Line 3

Post Code

E-mail Address

Telephone Number

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Title

First Name

Last Name

Organisation

Address Line 1

Address Line 2

Address Line 3

Post Code

E-mail Address

Telephone 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

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

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:

Continue onto next page

If your representation 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

Delete green gap designation and include site within settlement 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

To fully consider reasons for designation of site within green gap.

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

Church Hill Ramsey

This representation is twofold; first it concerns the development of a small part of a wider site having a direct frontage on to Church Hill, with access served by a single drive utilising an existing vehicular crossover. The dwellings would be set in line with the ribbon of housing to the west. This development would be consistent with other housing recently approved along Church Hill, further from the settlement of Dovercourt. Secondly, the wider site was shown to be outside the green gap designation within the Council's draft Local Plan 2014 and pre-Submission Plan 2016. The Council has now sought to impose a blanket restriction on development of the site through the designation of a strategic 'green gap'.



2016 Draft Plan

An appeal decision in September 2016, concerning the development of the land to the west of Mayes Lane with 71 dwellings is a material consideration in examining this proposal. First, there was no concern raised by the Inspector that the site was not in a sustainable location. The primary issue was significant effect on the setting of St Michaels Church. The Inspector gave appropriate criticism of the impact upon the views of the church from Essex Way, the views from the south west corner of the site, the views from the access road to Two Villages School and the change in rural character to the setting of the church.

The Inspector did not however consider that the development of the site would contravene the fundamental aim of the Green Gap as proposed in 2016 (paragraph 25). The inclusion of the entire site within the Green Gap is therefore unnecessary, inappropriate and unjustified. It is considered that there are opportunities for limited development of the site

without causing the impact upon the setting of the church or the wider area. In this respect, the potential development of 3 dwellings can demonstrate the limited, if any, effect this scheme would have upon the character of the area or setting of the church. The following plan which forms an illustrative layout of the proposed development, demonstrates the field of vision from the south and south west. Area 1 refers to the land in front of the school. The scheme would not alter the existing views of the church nor affect the rural context of the churchyard, which would otherwise retain the open character to both the east and west. Area 2 is the 'corridor' of view from the south west, as opined by the Inspector as being especially important, and again would be unaffected by this proposal



Area 3 is the extent of view that in theory would be lost as a result of this scheme, except that as identified by the Inspector, the views from the southwest would be shielded by 'the landscape barrier of Whinny Grove Woods. There would therefore be no loss of public views of the church as a result of this scheme.

The remaining consideration is therefore the impact upon the immediate setting of the church, and whether this scheme would reduce the rural setting as identified within the appeal decision. It is clear that the proposal will introduce development closer to the church on the opposite side of the road. However, these dwellings would be no closer than the existing buildings on the north side of Church Hill. The distinctive setting of the church would not therefore be compromised. The open space to either side of the church would remain, ensuring the church is seen in its rural setting and as a prominent and important part of the street scene. Any loss of setting, if any, would be oblique and less than harmful. The statutory duty to protect the setting of the listed building will not therefore be compromised.

It is therefore suggested that the extension of the green gap designation is inappropriate and should revert to the extent shown upon the pre-submission plan. Further, the minor extension to the development limits along Church Hill would represent a sustainable form of development.