

Andy,

Thank you for your full reply.

On the other information, I understand the uncertainty and the speculative nature of the current proposals and the Parish Council are grateful that Gateway120 are prepared to share these with us and start a dialogue. My questions are in one sense it to engage in that dialogue, to make it clear what some of the views from Marks Tey are likely to be, and to better inform Marks Tey residents.

On infrastructure, much of our infrastructure in Marks Tey, particularly the highways evidenced by the daily long queues and environmental problems, is already overloaded and this will increase over the coming years. It is thus not an issue of new development making minimum disruption or not making the situation any worse but of how that development can not only deal with its own but can also relieve existing pressure. You may feel this is not the responsibility of Gateway120 but it is very much a factor that will be used to judge your proposals.

There are pro and cons for such a major new development in north Essex which must be judged on its own merits not on provision of a new A120 (which is a periphery benefit if the overall idea of a new community is a good one) particularly as depending on how the development is undertaken it may so load existing infrastructure (roads, schools, health, etc) so as to be little different or worse than what exists.

A new/expanded community of the size proposed by Gateway120 is of national significance (few others are proposed around the country). What people thus have a right to expect from the public authorities, developers and agents is a proposal of national excellence, which if undertaken all are proud of, else it shouldn't be done. This is both a challenge and responsibility for you but also a challenge and responsibility for us to ensure that this calibre of consideration and decision is actually undertaken.

Apologies, this was going to be a simple thank you note!

Allan Walker MBA, BSc, Dip Arch
Chairman, Marks Tey Parish Council

Dear Allan

Thanks for your email. I am sorry it has taken a little time to reply. You should by now have received a copy of our response to Mr Jellard's questions on the A120.

On the three points in your email (two from you and one from Andrew Martin) I can comment as follows: -

1. As a matter of basic principle it would of course be necessary to programme the proposed development over various phases simply because of its size and complexity. It is too early in the project to know what the overall phasing would be, and indeed it would depend on a number of factors including the requirements of the local authorities and the way in which the timing and location of development ties in with the ability to provide the right level of infrastructure at the right time. We would also need to consider the particular

requirements of the local authorities themselves, who will need to balance short term requirements to meet housing supply needs with a longer term programme of larger sites. Because the G120 proposals have two distinct elements, linked by the improvements to the A120, and because we are going to be making contributions to the housing supply of both Braintree and Colchester, it is quite possible that the early stages of phasing would be at both West Tey and Temple Border. Part of that decision making process is also likely to include a full analysis of the way in which those early stages can be achieved with minimum disruption to the overall use of the existing highway network. Gateway 120 fully understands the concerns of local residents about the short term effects of large scale development before the associated roads improvements are properly operational and there will be a full opportunity to discuss those with all parties, including the local people, during the lead-in to the project.

2. On your second point, there is a clear need to make sure that emerging proposals for improvement of the A12 are properly coordinated with the need to incorporate a new junction with the A120, and Gateway 120 will be working to ensure that that coordination is properly handled. Within those discussions it would be appropriate to look at timing and the manner in which the new A120 can be provided; at present gateway 120 hopes that there will be an opportunity to bring it forward quite early in the development process. Within that overall position it may well be possible to ensure that planning of the new West Tey development is undertaken in a way that seeks to alleviate the short-term effects of additional traffic, and your suggestion shows that it should be possible, by that means or others, to reduce the short term effects.

3. You did make the point at the meeting that you hoped that the major landowners would not pursue proposals independently to the possible detriment of a fully coordinated solution that would work best for the proper planning of the area, and at the meeting I did respond to that. Andrew Martin is making the same point, and at this stage my response would be the same. It is not the landowners who are the decision makers in the overall process, it is, of course the local authorities, through consultation with all those bodies and individuals who are part of the process. Gateway 120 and R F West Limited have no greater say at present than anyone else, and all parties are looking to see what the positions of the local authorities are. We know that Colchester has set out its options and that those options include the potential for a new settlement at Marks Tey, but at this stage that remains caveated with references to the possible intentions of Braintree, which are not in the public domain as yet. So, which Colchester is suggesting that there could be a new settlement of 15,000 houses, that is only if half that total is in Braintree. Gateway 120 has always taken a position that its proposals are sound and that they warrant consideration, but that it was for the local authorities to adopt the proposals for the right reasons and at the right time. That is one of the reasons why the Gateway 120 landowners have been promoting the scheme within the planning system for such a long time, waiting for acceptance that the time is right. It would seem that that time is approaching and Gateway 120 is happy to be part of that process. We have indicated the extent of land available in the 'Call for Sites' process and we have given appropriate further information about how it is felt the proposals would meet the need the councils have themselves identified. Presently, we, like everyone else, are waiting to see what Braintree's position will be so that we can gauge how the Gateway 120 proposal will fit with them.

Andrew Martin's question, we feel, goes well beyond the present position and makes assumptions about how much development will be allocated and where it is likely that development might be allocated by the councils. Gateway 120, on the other hand, does not wish to pre-empt those decisions. Mr Martin refers to 'all the major landowners involved' but

in view of my comments above we do not think that we are yet at that position. On the position of the new A12 junction, Gateway 120 have had very positive discussions with the landowner in the past, and if/when the junction is provided Highways England will have a major part to play in any case. Of course Gateway 120 will wish to be part of a collaborative process along with everyone with an interest in the future of Marks Tey and the scale and location of the new settlement is involved in the process; we feel however that it is not yet the time to be making proposals about the specifics of the development before the local authorities have had a full opportunity to consider just what it is that they collectively envisage.

I hope that this provides answers to the questions raised, but if there is anything outstanding do please let me know.

Andy Stevens
DipTP MRTPI MRICS
Managing Director
ASP

Hugh,

Thank you for the presentation. It is now on our website.

I also copy at the bottom below (as the e-mail address to me was incorrect) a comment from AMPlanning following on from my question at the session about Gateway120 Ltd and RF West Ltd talking together to produce the best solutions for the community. Obviously, I would want you both to talk and would not wish the development of Marks Tey to be a competition between two rival developers. I would seek your view.

Finally, on looking through your presentation again (I was a bit busy chairing through the original one), I have a couple of questions/comments for you.

- Firstly, do you have any phasing plans for the development? If I were you I would probably want to start at the Braintree end but clearly this will only increase traffic on the overloaded portion of the A120 through Marks Tey and thus an early start to relieving traffic problems through Marks Tey is likely to appeal more to us.
- In this vein, with design work starting this year on the widening of the A12 (with construction in 2019/20) and the need therefore to include the fundamental issue of a new access onto the A12 for the A120 (or not) it would seem worth pushing for the junction to be constructed with the A12 works and possibly running a 2 way road from this junction back to the A120 between Marks Tey and Coggeshall funded by S106. This road would provide a short term by-pass for Marks Tey and possibly relief for the Coggeshall/Kevelton back road link whilst being a construction road for development. When (and if) the A120 is dualled to Braintree this road could then become a local distributor and take the new development traffic away from the existing A120 through Marks Tey which otherwise would carry all of the eastward new development traffic and be as busy or worse than now.

I'm obviously sharing these views with others and am happy to discuss if appropriate.

Regards and thanks again,
Allan Walker
Chairman, Marks Tey Parish Council

Dear Allan,

I refer to the presentation given by representatives on behalf of Gateway 120 on Monday evening. This was attended by Andrew Martin together with Jack and Daniel West of R F West Ltd.

I understand that following the presentation you invited attendees to send to you any outstanding questions for the Gateway 120 team.

On behalf of R F West Ltd we would like to confirm that on the advice of Karen Syrett at Colchester BC we have tried to contact the Gateway 120 team with a view to meeting to discuss proposals for growth at Marks Tey. To date they have not responded and there has been no engagement between the landowners. Given that their proposed new A12/A120 interchange is indicated partly on land under the control of our clients we find it surprising that there has been no such contact. We would advise that the level of infrastructure likely to be required will necessitate the collaboration and contributions from of all the major landowners involved. Our submissions to the Borough Council via the 'Call for Sites' documentation made a clear statement that R F West are willing to engage with CBC, Essex County Council, Marks Tey Parish Council, the Highways Agency, National Rail, and other major stakeholders.

Via the Parish Council we would like to confirm this position and invite the Gateway 120 team to make contact with us and respond positively to potential collaborative working going forward.

Kind regards

Julie Cross

Andrew Martin – Planning

Planning | Design | Development