

# CHAPTER 8: CONNECTED PLACES

## Policy CP1: Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

ID	Rep ID	Name. Organisation	Legally compliant	Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/ written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan	Council response	Contact details
<b>Representations from Technical Stakeholders</b>															
908048	LPPuD6	Essex Bridleways Association - Sue Dobson	Y	Y	N	x	x	x	x	H	N	[Summaries prepared by Council Officers but the full original representations will be available to the Inspector and for public view] Paragraph 8.0.5 acknowledges that new development offers the opportunity to link places in a sustainable way; however, the opportunity is lost here to ensure that any new links are accessible by as many user groups as possible, including equestrians, as has been stated in other Policies within the Plan. We suggest that this aspect is clarified to ensure consistency throughout the Plan's policies. The first paragraph of Policy CP1 states that new development "should include and encourage opportunities for access to sustainable modes of transport, including walking cycling and public transport". We suggest that this policy covers all vulnerable road users and is reworded to reflect this.	Reword Policy CP1 and supporting text to refer to ensuring new links are accessible by as many user groups as possible, including equestrians.	The Chapter is concerned mainly with how to manage day-to-day travel requirements and promote sustainable solutions. Although it does not distinguish between recreational and non-recreational travel, horse-riding is likely to remain a recreational mode of transport. Policy HP 5: Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities includes an Accessibility Standard and Quantity Standard for bridleways. The plan approach would not prevent developing the bridleway network further, where opportunities arise.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.
1007301	LPPuD41	Essex County Council – Matthew Jericho	Y	Y	N			x		W	N	The amendment strengthens linkages to the Essex Local Transport Plan (LTP).	Include the following text after paragraph 8.1.3. The LTP is supported by a suite of more specific documents including the Bus Strategy, the Cycling Strategy, the Sustainable Modes of Travel Strategy, and implementation plans that are also periodically updated by Essex County Council.	The Council deems this change to be appropriate and a modification is suggested.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.
1007301	LPPuD42	Essex County Council – Matthew Jericho	Y	Y	N			x		W	N	It would be beneficial to reference the Essex Cycling Strategy and that cycling infrastructure will be provided in accordance with this.	Change paragraph so the following is inserted as the last sentence to read as follows: The Essex Cycling Strategy will be used as a guide to ensure the provision of appropriate cycling infrastructure.	The Council deems this change to be appropriate and a modification is suggested.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.
1022174	LPPuD160	Network Rail – Elliot Stamp	Y	Y	Y					H	N	Paragraph 8.1.5 states that the 'Council will support and encourage measures which will make rail use a more attractive and sustainable alternative to the use of private cars for both local journeys and longer commutes and to the use of HGVs for freight transportation.' The Council's support for rail transport is welcomed by Network Rail, however the council should strongly consider the industry rail strategy / Route Study as part of their local plan process. This will help to ensure that local planning policy relating to the railway is in line with Network Rail's strategic plans. Network Rail would be happy to discuss this in more detail with the Council.	Consider the Industry Rail Strategy/Route Strategy as part of the Local Plan process.	The comments are noted and an amendment to paragraph 8.15 is suggested.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.
<b>Representations from Businesses, Landowners and Developers</b>															
1007356	LPPuD10	Thorpe Hall Leisure Ltd (c/o Tony Collins – Collins & Coward Ltd)	Y	Y	N	x	x	x	x	?	Y	This policy lies at the heart of the Lifehouse Regeneration Project which offers sustainable and easy connections to bus and rail services. A mixed-use approach to the site also offers opportunities to minimise journeys by car and encourage trips by cycle or walking particularly to Thorpe High Street.	No specific changes to Policy CP1 suggested.	Thorpe Hall Leisure Ltd are promoting the inclusion of land for development in the Local Plan and this is addressed under other policies. A planning application was refused by the Council and later dismissed on appeal – with highway grounds being one of the reasons. No specific changes to Policy CP1 are being suggested.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.
<b>Representations from Community Representatives</b>															
None received.															
<b>Representations from Members of the Public</b>															
1007238	LPPuD484	Carol Bannister	Y	Y	N	x	x		x	?	?	Weeley's transport network is already heavily congested and not direct or frequent enough to larger urban areas, road improvements would take years to complete, is difficult or dangerous to attempt. Therefore large scale development is not suitable for this area. Long transport development times would cause misery for many residents including the high elderly population in the area and have adverse effects on their health and wellbeing; this is contrary to the principles set out in policy CP1. The A133 between Weeley and Clacton needs to become safer before any other issues are addressed.	No specific changes to Policy CP1 suggested.	Mrs. Bannister objects to the allocation of land south of Thorpe Road, Weeley through Policy SAMU5 and her objections are mainly addressed under that policy. The development has since obtained outline planning permission. No specific changes to Policy CP1 are being suggested.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.

1007178	LPPuD342	David Wendon			N					N	N	During the time this report has been produced Alresford had 4 busses an hour between Colchester and Brightlingsea via Wivenhoe, which reduced to 3 and then 2. Another operator has extended some buses from Wivenhoe during the day seemingly providing 4 busses an hour but since these two operators run within 1minute of each other in reality there is only a half hourly service. The infrequent evening and Sunday services are subsidised by ECC. Alresford has a railway station but trains in general only stop hourly. Apart from a couple of early morning and evening trains that go through to/from London it is necessary to change to a London train at Colchester. It is not possible to shorten the journey time by changing at Wivenhoe, as the trains that stop at Alresford follow the Clacton to London trains which stop there, thus necessitating the extended journey to Colchester to wait and change trains.	No specific changes to Policy CP1 suggested.	Mr. Wendon is concerned about the amount of development that has been approved at Alresford and the adequacy of local infrastructure to accommodate it. The availability of public transport was considered by the Planning Inspectorate when they dealt with the appeals for land off Cockaynes Lane before deciding to allow those appeals. No specific changes to Policy CP1 are being suggested.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.
---------	----------	--------------	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--	--

The only representor requesting any specific change to Policy CP1 is the Essex Bridleway Association who request greater acknowledgement of equestrians and opportunities to ensure new transport links meet their needs. However, as this policy is mainly concerned with the managing day-to-day travel requirements as opposed to recreational use, which is covered by Policy HP5, no changes to the policy are considered necessary. Policy CP1 is therefore considered to be sound and no modifications are required. Network Rail suggest that any improvements to the rail network for Tendring should be planned in the context of its industrial rail strategy/Route Study. This can be referenced for further clarity in para 8.1.5.

**Suggested modification:** Add the following text at the end of paragraph 8.13 as advised by Essex County Council:

5. Provide sustainable access and travel choice for Essex residents to help create sustainable communities.

The Local Transport Plan (LTP) is supported by a suite of more specific documents including the Bus Strategy, the Cycling Strategy, the Sustainable Modes of Travel Strategy, and implementation plans that are also periodically updated by Essex County Council.

8.14 To reduce greenhouse gas emissions.....

Suggested modification: Add the following to the end of para. 8.1.5.

8.15 The Council will support and encourage measures which will make rail use a more attractive and sustainable alternative to the use of private cars for vboth local journeys and longer commutes and to the use of HGVs for freight transportation. The Council will work with Network Rail to improve rail connectivity in the context of their Industrial Rail Strategy/Route Stratgey. Specific infrastructure projects will be integrated into the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

**Suggested modification:** Add the following sentence at the end of Policy CP1 as advised by Essex County Council

.... of transport demonstrated.

**Travel Plans and Residential Travel Information Packs should be provided as appropriate and in accordance with Essex County Council published guidance.**

**The Essex Cycling Strategy will be used as a guide to ensure the provision of appropriate cycling infrastructure.**

**Policy CP2: Improving the Transport Network**

ID	Rep ID	Name. Organisation	Legally compliant	Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation [Summaries prepared by Council Officers but the full original representations will be available to the Inspector and for public view]	Proposed change to Local Plan	Council response	Contact details
<b>Representations from Technical Stakeholders</b>															
1007301	LPPuD43	Essex County Council – Matthew Jericho	Y	Y	N			x		W	N	The statement that ‘thereby preventing traffic congestion which would otherwise occur’ is over promising what may well be the case in reality.	Change paragraph 8.2.4 to read as follows: ‘. thereby helping to ease traffic congestion that otherwise would occur’.	The Council deems this change to be appropriate.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector’s Programme Officer.
1105514	LPPuD56	University of Essex - Nick Davey	Y	Y	Y					?	N	The University of Essex welcomes the commitment to the provision of a new link road between the A120 and the A133, to the east of Colchester. As is set out in the policy, this link needs to be put in place, during the early phases of the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community, in order to avoid exacerbating existing traffic congestion and transportation issues on the east side of Colchester.	No specific changes to Policy CP2 suggested.	Support is noted.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector’s Programme Officer.
1022174	LPPuD161	Network Rail – Elliot Stamp	Y	Y	Y					H	N	In relation to paragraph 8.2.2, any increase in services may require infrastructure investment, subject to development, funding and a Value for Money case.	No specific changes to Policy CP2 suggested.	Comments noted but no changes required.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector’s Programme Officer.
1022174	LPPuD163	Network Rail – Elliot Stamp	Y	Y	Y					H	N	In relation to paragraph 8.2.5, opportunities to improve railway crossings are welcomed when safety improvements are prioritised. Network Rail would need to be included in any level crossing planning processes and potential developer contributions.	No specific changes to Policy CP2 suggested.	Comments noted but no changes required.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector’s Programme Officer.
<b>Representations from Businesses, Landowners and Developers</b>															
1021061	LPPuD310	NEEB Holdings – John Mason, Carter Jonas	Y	Y	Y					?	?	NEEB Holdings supports the Councils stance on new development which will contribute to the provision of a safe and efficient transport network. NEEB Holdings believes there to be the potential to provide safety and efficiency gains, and other benefits, in relation to the A120 between Colchester and Harwich through an appropriately sited new local service area at the new roundabout to be created west of Little Bentley. There are currently no service stations on the A120 between Ardleigh South and Harwich, a distance of some 14 miles. The A133 by comparison is much better provided for, with services near Great Bentley, Weeley and Clacton. The 2.2ha site between Harwich Road and the A120, west of Little Bentley, would be a suitable site for such provision. NEEB Holdings support the allocation of the site between Harwich Road and the A120 for servicing/employment use and would be pleased to work with the Council in exploring the potential for such provision in order to strengthen and improve this key economic corridor.	No specific changes to Policy CP2 suggested.	NEEB Holdings are promoting the inclusion of land for development in the Local Plan and this is addressed under other policies. No specific changes to Policy CP2 are being suggested. Such a specific proposal is best considered, on its merits, through the development management process rather than through any specific allocation or planning policy in the Local Plan.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector’s Programme Officer.
1106151	LPPuD331	Gladman Homes – Phil Bamford	Y	Y	N			x		?	Y	Gladman object to Policy CP2 in that it states that proposals which would have any adverse transport impacts will not be granted planning permission. This is completely contrary to the Framework. Para 32 of the NPPF states that development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. Policy CP2 should therefore be reworded to avoid it being unsound.	Reword the third bullet paragraph of Policy CP2 as follows: “Proposals which would have any adverse severe residual cumulative transport impacts will not be granted planning permission unless these are able to be resolved and the development made acceptable by specific mitigation measures which are guaranteed to be implemented”.	The change suggested by Gladman Homes would bring the policy into line with paragraph 32 of the NPPF and therefore a minor modification to this policy is recommended – broadly along the lines of Gladman Homes’ suggestion.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector’s Programme Officer.
<b>Representations from Community Representatives</b>															
None received.															
<b>Representations from Members of the Public</b>															
None received.															

The only representors requesting any specific change to Policy CP2 is Gladman Homes who object to the third paragraph of the policy which, as worded, seeks to guard against ‘any’ adverse transport impacts as opposed to ‘severe cumulative impacts’ as required by the NPPF. A modification is suggested to address this issue and ensure consistency with NPPF. Essex County Council’s suggested change to paragraph 8.2.4 is also accepted.

**Suggested modification:** Amend paragraph 8.2.4 as advised by Essex County Council and to reflect current requirements:

8.2.4 Major growth areas in West Tendring/East Colchester and Clacton will require new strategic highway and public transport infrastructure which will not only serve the development areas themselves but also provide for two major new roads to ensure that traffic is able to move through and between settlements efficiently, thereby ~~preventing~~ helping to ease traffic congestion ~~which would~~ that otherwise would occur.

**Suggested modification** Amend paragraph 8.2.4 to update the current position regarding strategic transport and access planning in Clacton

8.2.4 ~~These two new roads will be between the A120 and A133~~ A strategic link road between the A120 and A133 and Rapid Transit System will be required to support the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Strategic access improvements will be required in Clacton to connect the A133 to the western area of the town improving accessibility and circulation around the town and supporting further planned growth. at west Clacton between the A133 and B1027. The agreed route and specification of this connection/s (including for public transport and active travel) will be subject to further transport planning and assessment with Essex County Council and its planning and delivery detailed in future plans. ~~at west Clacton between the A133 and B1027.~~

**Suggested modification:** Delete the second paragraph of Policy CP2 Improving the Transport Network and replace with the following to reflect the current position regarding HIF funding for the A120/A133 Link Road associated with the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community and issues around strategic transport and access planning in Clacton and the suggestion that the Hartley Gardens development proposed through Policy SAMU2 could be defined as a ‘broad location’ for development:

- ~~Major Growth areas at the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community (Tendring and Colchester Borders) and at Clacton will require provision of new and/or improved road infrastructure in order to fully serve the new growth areas and to avoid causing traffic congestion in the existing adjacent settlements. Strategic link roads will be required between the A120 and A133 and between the A133 and B1027 respectively in addition to improvements for non-motorised travel.~~
- The Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community will require a strategic link road between the A120 and A133 and a Rapid Transit System to support the new Garden Community. These infrastructure works have secured funding from the Housing Infrastructure Fund and are currently subject to further and more detailed planning and delivery. Further transport assessment work will be undertaken by Essex County Council (the highway authority) and Tendring District Council to identify the optimal route, specification and design of access improvements (including public transport and active travel) to Clacton from the A133 to the western side of the town. This will improve existing accessibility and support new growth areas and future development.

**Suggested modification:** Delete the third paragraph of Policy CP2 in response to the comments from Gladman Homes and replace with the following in accordance with NPPF:

- ~~Proposals which would have any adverse transport impacts will not be granted planning permission unless these are able to be resolved and the development made acceptable by specific mitigation measures which are guaranteed to be implemented. Proposals will be not be granted planning permission if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impact on the road network would be severe~~

**Policy CP3: Improving the Telecommunications Network**

ID	Rep ID	Name. Organisation	Legally compliant	Duty to Co-operate	Sound	Positively prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Hearing/ written rep	Supporting docs	Summary of representation	Proposed change to Local Plan	Council response	Contact details
<b>Representations from Technical Stakeholders</b>															
1102526	LPPuD159	Home Builders Federation – Mark Behrendt	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	H	N	Whilst paragraphs 43 to 46 of the NPPF establishes that local planning authorities should seek support the expansion of electronic communications networks it does not seek to prevent development that does not have access to such networks. By stating all, new dwellings must be served by super-fast broadband potentially allows the Council to refuse a development without such provision or impose a Grampian condition preventing a development from being occupied until such networks are provided. The provision of super-fast broadband is not in the control of the developer who requires a third party provider for such infrastructure. It is also the case that the house building industry is fully aware of the benefits of having their homes connected to super-fast broadband and what their customers will demand. We are also concerned that no additional costs have been included in the viability study for such provision. In seeking to extend broadband to homes the Council should work proactively with telecommunications providers to extend provision and not rely on the development industry to provide for such infrastructure.	The fourth bullet point of Policy CP3 following part d) of this policy should be deleted.	The delivery of superfast broadband across the district is a high priority for the Council and is a key element of its Economic Strategy. The Council has imposed this requirement on a number of developments through the use of planning conditions and this has often been upheld by Planning Inspectors on appeal. The Council recognises and supports the importance the development industry places upon broadband provision and will expect to see most new residential developments achieving a high standard of connection. Policy CP3 already recognises that there will be circumstances where it might not be possible, practical or economically viable to achieve what the policy wants and, in those circumstances, off-site contributions may or may not be sought. No changes to the policy are therefore considered necessary.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.
<b>Representations from Businesses, Landowners and Developers</b>															
1022640	LPPuD249	Persimmon Homes – David Moseley	Y	Y	Y					?	?	The provision of super-fast broadband is not in the control of the developer who requires a third party provider for such infrastructure. The house building industry is fully aware of the benefits of having their homes connected to super-fast broadband and what their customers will demand. We are concerned that no additional costs have been included in the viability study for such provision. We consider it essential that this policy is properly costed within the viability study, in particular the cost of such a policy on smaller developments in more rural communities. Without this additional evidence there is clearly no justification to support this policy. In seeking to extend broadband to homes the Council should work proactively with telecommunications providers to extend provision and not rely on the development industry to provide for such infrastructure.	The fourth bullet point of Policy CP3 following part d) of this policy should be deleted.	The delivery of superfast broadband across the district is a high priority for the Council and is a key element of its Economic Strategy. The Council has imposed this requirement on a number of developments through the use of planning conditions and this has often been upheld by Planning Inspectors on appeal. The Council recognises and supports the importance the development industry places upon broadband provision and will expect to see most new residential developments achieving a high standard of connection. Policy CP3 already recognises that there will be circumstances where it might not be possible, practical or economically viable to achieve what the policy wants and, in those circumstances, off-site contributions may or may not be sought. No changes to the policy are therefore considered necessary.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.
1106162	LPPuD404	Persimmon Homes – Matthew Parsons	Y	Y	Y					?	?	The provision of super-fast broadband is not in the control of the developer who requires a third party provider for such infrastructure. The house building industry is fully aware of the benefits of having their homes connected to super-fast broadband and what their customers will demand. We are concerned that no additional costs have been included in the viability study for such provision. We consider it essential that this policy is properly costed within the viability study, in particular the cost of such a policy on smaller developments in more rural communities. Without this additional evidence there is clearly no justification to support this policy. In seeking to extend broadband to homes the Council should work proactively with telecommunications providers to extend provision and not rely on the development industry to provide for such infrastructure.	The fourth bullet point of Policy CP3 following part d) of this policy should be deleted.	The delivery of superfast broadband across the district is a high priority for the Council and is a key element of its Economic Strategy. The Council has imposed this requirement on a number of developments through the use of planning conditions and this has often been upheld by Planning Inspectors on appeal. The Council recognises and supports the importance the development industry places upon broadband provision and will expect to see most new residential developments achieving a high standard of connection. Policy CP3 already recognises that there will be circumstances where it might not be possible, practical or economically viable to achieve what the policy wants and, in those circumstances, off-site contributions may or may not be sought. No changes to the policy are therefore considered necessary.	Details only available to the local authority and the Inspector's Programme Officer.
<b>Representations from Community Representatives</b>															
None received.															
<b>Representations from Members of the Public</b>															
None received.															

Persimmon Homes and the Home Builders Federation have challenged Policy CP3's requirement for all new dwellings and non-residential buildings to be served by at least a superfast broadband connection. The Council considers this element of the policy to be critical to its Economic Strategy and does not accept the suggestion that it should be deleted. The policy contains sufficient flexibility to account for cases where achieving a superfast broadband connection in the way envisaged is not possible, practical or viable and is therefore considered to be sound and no modifications are required.