

From: parish.clerk@marksteyparish.org.uk
Sent: 09 January 2018 16:59
To: 'copseyandrea@gmail.com'
Subject: RE: Additional documents for the North Essex Authorities Section 1 Plan Examination

Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

Dear Andrea

At a meeting of the Parish Council on Monday 8 January it was resolved that the following should be submitted to response to your attached email

Can I ask please that you acknowledge receipt of this email

Marks Tey Parish Council wishes to object to Icen/Cirrus Land/Gateway120 Hearing Statement on the following basis: -

The Icen proposals are not in the spirit of the Garden Community principles.

Their proposals are detrimental to the interests and future of Marks Tey. The Parish Council would question the level of contact that Icen/Cirrus Land/Gateway120 have had with the community in contradiction to their claim to local involvement and on that basis question their future intent.

Their proposals do not address the proposed A12 alterations and improvement nor the current saturated highway situation in relation to the A120

Their proposals do not commit to nor conform with the North Essex Garden Communities Charter proposed in the Local Plan.

We would also comment more specifically under the following headings: -

Self interest

Icen suggest themselves as 'master developer' (0.15). This key co-ordinating role should not be held by land owners/developers with their obvious level of self-interest. This should be the role of a Local Development Corporation with CPO powers to encourage landowner participation. Icen's proposals in the 'Design Statements' propose a new town centre in the centre of their area of control. This is disadvantageous to other landowners and gives one private group an unfair advantage. It also does not give flexibility over time to adapt to changing situations.

Detriment to Marks Tey Parish

Gateway120 have undertaken 2 presentations to Marks Tey Parish Council in open sessions over the last two years and these essentially similar presentations have simply shown photos of much smaller schemes such as Poundsbury. They have not explained their approach to their development nor is there any indication that they have taken into consideration information gathered through our Neighbourhood Plan questionnaires on what is important within the development. They may have captured this by other means but we are not aware of anything. The Icen proposals greatly threaten existing Marks Tey residents: there is a minimal 'buffer' between the existing Marks Tey estate (Long Green) and the new development (unlike the park in CBC's Development Proposals which is also part of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan proposal.) Icen's proposed new town centre on the existing A120 is immediately adjacent to Little Tey. This community has been identified in the Neighbourhood Plan process as needing to retain its

existing character which has been recognised in the CBC Development plan proposals. Also, there is no indication of 'infrastructure first' which is a CBC local plan commitment and an underpinning principle for Marks Tey Parish

Not Addressing A12 Improvements

Highways England are currently considering moving an improved widened A12 further to the south east of its current line. Icenis proposals in limiting the development north of the current A12 make no accommodation of these factors. Further they seem to suggest that development can start with no alleviation of the current capacity problems on the existing A120 (see above comments.) This will thrust significant additional access problems on the local community.

Non-Conformity with NE Essex Garden Community Principles

All of the above indicate a deviation from the Garden Community Principles and no commitment is given in Icenis presentation to the Principles. This is very worrying and indicative of what Icenis propose.

Marks Tey Parish Council therefore request that Icenis submission be dismissed.

Steve Marrioff CiLCA

Parish Clerk and Responsible Financial Officer

Marks Tey Parish Council

Council Offices
Old London Road
Marks Tey
CO6 1EJ
Telephone: 01206 213250



Please note that my working days are Tuesday and Thursday

Unless otherwise stated, the contents of this message should not be taken as necessarily being the views, opinions, policies or procedures of Marks Tey Parish Council.

From: Andrea Copsey [mailto:copseyandrea@gmail.com]

Sent: 21 December 2017 15:04

To: undisclosed-recipients:

Subject: Additional documents for the North Essex Authorities Section 1 Plan Examination

Dear Sir/Madam,

The following documents have been, or will shortly be, published by the North Essex Authorities on the Evidence Base, Garden Communities page of the examination website:

EB/064	North Essex Local Plan Section 1 Viability Infrastructure
EB/065	North Essex Local Plan Section 1 Housing Trajectories
EB/066	Rapid Transport Plan

The purposes of the documents, which were provided by the North Essex Authorities at the Inspector's request, can be summarised as follows:

Review of Scheme Contingency Allowances: Paragraph 6.8b.3 of the North Essex Authorities' Matter 6 hearing statement states that "an analysis of strategic infrastructure items indicates that there are circa £120m contingencies in-built to the cost assumptions for the Colchester Braintree Borders viability assessment". This document explains how those contingencies are built up.

Infrastructure Cost Assumptions: This document sets out the sources and relevant assumptions for the infrastructure cost items contained in the Hvas Section 1 Viability Assessment (EB/03/1/2 & 2/2)

Comparison of Housing Trajectories: This document sets out the housing delivery trajectories for the proposed garden communities as they appear in (1) Appendix 1 to the BDC Publication Draft Local Plan, the Appendix to CBC's Housing Land Supply Statement (CBC/0025) and Table LP2 of the TDC Publication Draft Plan and (2) Table 4.2.4 of the Hvas Section 1 Viability Assessment. There are year on year differences between the Councils' separate work on trajectories and the viability document, but the North Essex Authorities do not consider the differences to be significant, as delivery in the plan period generally achieves the same outcomes.

If you wish to comment on any of these additional documents, the Inspector will accept your comments provided that:

- They are kept as brief as possible;
- They clearly identify which of the document(s) they refer to;
- They are confined to specific comments on the documents listed above only, and no other representations of any kind are submitted;
- They are emailed to me to arrive **by 5pm on Wednesday 10 January 2018**.
(This deadline has been set to allow comments to be posted on the examination website in sufficient time to be read before the hearings open.)

The inspector has also asked me to inform you that the deadline for emailed comments on the additional documents submitted by Icenl (on behalf of G120, Cirrus Land & L&Q), of which I informed you by email last Friday 15 December, has been extended to the same date, ie **5pm on Wednesday 10 January 2018**.

Additional Statements of Common Ground have also been, or will shortly be, published on the examination website. As with hearing statements, the inspector is not inviting and will not accept comments on these. Their purpose is to inform the discussion at the hearings.

Kind regards,

Andrea Copsey
Local Plans Programme Officer

Mobile: 07842 643988

Pease note: As from 4pm today I will be on leave and not accessing emails until 3rd January 2018.