



planning direct



## Ardleigh Neighbourhood Plan 2020 - 2033 Regulation 14 Consultation Statement

On behalf of: Ardleigh Parish Council

Prepared by: N O'Hagan BA (Hons)

Date: 18/01/2023

[planningdirect.co.uk](http://planningdirect.co.uk) | [enquiries@planningdirect.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@planningdirect.co.uk) | 01473 407911

---

## NOTICE

This document has been prepared for the stated purpose in Accordance with the Agreement under which our services were commissioned and should not be used for any other purpose without the prior written consent of Planning Direct. We accept no responsibility or liability for the consequences of this document being used for a purpose other than that for which it was commissioned.

© Planning Direct. All rights reserved. No part of this document may be otherwise reproduced or published in any form or by any means, including photocopying, storage on a computer or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright holder.

Planning Direct is a trading name of Cicero Communication Ltd. Registered in England and Wales, no. 7986959.

July 2020



The Furnace, The Maltings, Princes Street,  
Ipswich, IP1 1SB

 01473 407911

 [enquiries@planningdirect.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@planningdirect.co.uk)

 [www.planningdirect.co.uk](http://www.planningdirect.co.uk)

---

# Table of Contents

Introduction .....	4
Details of the persons and bodies consulted .....	5
Explanation of the consultation process .....	7
Main issues and concerns & how these have been considered by the Parish Council and, where relevant, addressed in the Plan.....	11
Online forms.....	11
Other consultation responses .....	17
Conclusion.....	51
Appendix A: notification letter .....	52
Appendix B: Ardleigh Advertiser advert .....	53
Appendix C: online consultation form .....	54
Appendix D - online form responses .....	55

---

## Introduction

This Regulation 14 Consultation Statement has been produced to accompany the Ardleigh Neighbourhood Plan.

The Ardleigh Neighbourhood Plan - “the Plan” - sets out policies that relate to the development and use of land within only the Ardleigh Neighbourhood Area.

Regulation 14 of *The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012* required the Neighbourhood Planning body to publicise and consult on their Plan before its submission to the Local Planning Authority.

Regulation 15 of *The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012* requires the Neighbourhood Planning body to submit a consultation statement to the Local Planning Authority alongside their Plan. Per paragraph (2) of regulation 15, a “consultation statement” means a document which:

- (a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan [or neighbourhood development plan as proposed to be modified.];
- (b) explains how they were consulted;
- (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
- (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan [or neighbourhood development plan as proposed to be modified.]

This document provides a consultation statement in accordance with the above regulations.

---

## Details of the persons and bodies consulted

All relevant consultation bodies in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 of *The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012* were contacted directly, including:

Essex County Council (Highways and Education & Archaeology & Heritage & sustainable Urban Drainage Systems & Minerals and waste);  
Essex Place Services (Ecology);  
Essex Police;  
Natural England;  
Lichfields (developers of the forthcoming Garden Community);  
National Highways;  
Colchester Borough Council;  
Crockleford Heath and Elmstead Action Group (CEAG);  
Essex County Fire and Rescue Service;  
Tendring District Council;  
The Coal Authority;  
The Homes and Communities Agency;  
The Environment Agency;  
English Heritage;  
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited;  
The Marine Management Organisation;  
[newsitereceptioneastofengland@openreach.co.uk](mailto:newsitereceptioneastofengland@openreach.co.uk) (electronic communications);  
Primary Care Trust;  
UK Power Networks;  
Cadent Gas Ltd;  
Anglian Water.

Also consulted was the local population, both residential and working.

A number of key local businesses/service providers were contacted directly, including:

Ardleigh Advertiser; Ardleigh Boarding Cattery; Ardleigh Caravan Park; Ardleigh Convenience Store; Ardleigh Takeaway; Ardleigh Post Office; Ardleigh Pre-School; Ardleigh Reservoir Committee; Ardleigh Sailing Club; Ardleigh Service Station; Ardleigh GP Surgery; Colchester Bowling Club; Collins Skip Hire; Co-op funeral services; DB

---

Concrete Ltd; Dragonfly Hotel (SURYA Hotels); Eastern Waste Disposal - Martells; Elm Park Hospital; Green Island Gardens; Prettyfields Vineyard; SRC Ltd; St Mary's School.

---

## Explanation of the consultation process

The regulation 14 consultation process began on 08/08/22 and concluded on 23/09/22 at midday. Overall, the consultation period lasted for 6 weeks and 4 days.

### **Direct consultation**

All relevant consultation bodies in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 of *The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012* were contacted directly by phone, letter and/or email<sup>1</sup>. Contact details were generally provided by the LPA, Tendring District Council.

Key local businesses and service providers were also contacted directly by phone, letter and/or email<sup>2</sup>, including:

Ardleigh Advertiser; Ardleigh Boarding Cattery; Ardleigh Caravan Park; Ardleigh Convenience Store; Ardleigh Takeaway; Ardleigh Post Office; Ardleigh Pre-School; Ardleigh Reservoir Committee; Ardleigh Sailing Club; Ardleigh Service Station; Ardleigh GP Surgery; Colchester Bowling Club; Collins Skip Hire; Co-op funeral services; DB Concrete Ltd; Dragonfly Hotel (SURYA Hotels); Eastern Waste Disposal - Martells; Elm Park Hospital; Green Island Gardens; Prettyfields Vineyard; SRC Ltd; St Mary's School.

All posters, emails, letters, phone calls and adverts:

- directed interested persons to [ardleigh.website/our-plan](http://ardleigh.website/our-plan) where they could view copies of the Plan and make their representations online;
- invited interested persons to the drop-in consultation session due to be held at the Village Hall;
- gave other contact options for persons wishing to access hard copies of the Plan and/or make representations using other channels, including by email and post.

### **Traditional media**

An advert was also posted in the August edition of the Ardleigh Advertiser<sup>3</sup>, the local parish magazine which is available both in hard copy and online.

---

<sup>1</sup> a copy of the notification letter/email appears at Appendix A

<sup>2</sup> a copy of the notification letter/email appears at Appendix A

<sup>3</sup> a copy of the advert appears at Appendix B

---

Posters advertising the Village Hall drop-in session were also erected in prominent and well-frequented parts of the parish, including on the Parish Council's noticeboards, at the post office, village shop, petrol station and local garden centres.



*Copy of the poster*

**Online**

The relevant page of Ardleigh Parish Council's website - [ardleigh.website/our-plan](http://ardleigh.website/our-plan) - was



updated to advise parishioners of the ongoing consultation, provide access to the draft Plan documents, invite all interested parties to the drop-in Village Hall session on 24/08/2022 and enable representations to be submitted via the straightforward online form<sup>4</sup>. Contact details were also provided for anyone wishing to access a hard copy of the Plan and/or make their representation via email or post.



**REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION**

**Drop in Session 24 August**

There will be a Drop in Session at Ardleigh Village Hall on Weds 24 August from 2pm -7pm where members of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party will be available to answer questions and tell you more about the Plan. Hard copies of the Plan will be available at this session.

**Paper version of the Plan**

A paper copy of the plan is available for residents who are unable to access it online. Please call the Parish Clerk on 01206 616989 or email [info@ardleigh-oc.gov.uk](mailto:info@ardleigh-oc.gov.uk) to arrange to view or borrow a copy.

**Have your say**

A link to the consultation is below. Representations can also be made by email to [ardleighbn@gmail.com](mailto:ardleighbn@gmail.com) or by post to Ardleigh Parish Council PO Box 12865 Colchester CO7 7EZ. All representations must be accompanied by a name, address and, if relevant, the organisation you are representing.

[Have your say](#)

*[ardleigh.website/our-plan](https://www.ardleigh.gov.uk/our-plan) - regulation 14 consultation page*

Advertisements were also posted on relevant social media pages, including the Parish Council's Facebook page, other village Facebook groups and the Neighbourhood Plan Instagram account.

### ***In person***

A drop-in consultation session was held at Ardleigh Village Hall on 24/08/2022 from 2pm to 7pm. Members of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group were present throughout the day to answer questions and provide more information about the Plan. Hard copies of the Plan were available to view.

---

<sup>4</sup> a copy of the online form appears at Appendix C



*Photos of the Village Hall  
drop-in session on  
24/08/2022*

**Reminders & late submissions**

On 21/09/2022 and on the morning of 23/09/22, reminders of the consultation's closure were posted on the Parish Council's social media accounts, including Facebook and Instagram.

Although the consultation period formally ended at midday on 23/09/22, the online form was left open to enable late submissions to be considered at the Parish Council's discretion. No late representations were received, however.

---

# Main issues and concerns & how these have been considered by the Parish Council and, where relevant, addressed in the Plan

## Online forms

In total, 33 representations were made online by members of the general public. Of these, the vast majority (87%) expressed their support for the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

A summary of key issues and concerns raised by the online form submissions appears in the table below, accompanied by the comments of the Parish Council. Wherever an alteration has been made to the Plan, this is clearly indicated in the Parish Council's comments.

A full anonymised list of the consultation responses with the complete comments of the Parish Council appears at Appendix D.

### **Key issue 1: weight to the Plan**

A number of respondents raised concerns that the Plan would not be given due consideration during the consideration of planning applications and other matters in the Area.

Parish Council's response: Once adopted, Ardleigh Parish Council expects the District Council to give the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan their full statutory weight when making decisions in the area. The Parish Council will continue to comment on applications in their area and anticipate that the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will better support them to resist inappropriate development.

---

### **Key issue 2: cycling**

One respondent was concerned that there was not stronger commitment in the Plan to developing cycle routes.

Parish Council's response: The Parish Council is also very keen to promote cycling and other sustainable transport modes throughout the parish, however a Neighbourhood Plan - by its purpose and nature - is limited in what it can achieve. Policy CFP does provide support for new or improved community facilities, especially exercise-related leisure facilities. This could include, for example, new cycleways or other suitable cycling facilities. Policy TP also provides strong support for development that would improve existing cycleways or provide new cycleways.

### **Key issue 3: number of new homes**

Some respondents felt the Plan should do more to limit the number of houses built over the plan period.

Parish Council's response: The Neighbourhood Plan does not set any specific housing targets and the strategy of the Local Plan is that Ardleigh will sustain only modest housing growth over the plan period. The plan-led approach to development is of vital importance and the Parish Council expects all planning decisions to be made in light of this.

### **Key issue 4: school and surgery already over-subscribed**

One respondent commented that future development should be small scale as the school and surgery are already over-subscribed.

Parish Council's response: The Ardleigh Neighbourhood Plan recognises the well-evidenced pressures facing the village's key essential services such as the school and GP surgery. It makes bold efforts to protect these cherished and vital local facilities from the negative effects of new development - see policy CFP in particular. Ardleigh Parish Council will pay close attention to the effect and efficacy of these policies during their monitoring of the Plan.

---

**Key issue 5: pylons**

A number of respondents expressed concern about pylons development in the area.

Parish Council's response: This comment appears to be in relation to an ongoing major planning application for pylons works in the area which has generated a large local response. This is separate to the Neighbourhood Plan and the Parish Council has engaged with the community on this matter independently of the Plan.

**Key issue 6: design of the Garden Community**

Some respondents wanted to see more control over the design and location of the forthcoming Garden Community.

Parish Council's response: The Local Plan establishes that the design of the new garden community will be subject to its own, independent development plan document. Therefore, the Ardleigh Neighbourhood Plan is not able to directly influence its design or location etc. However, the Parish Council is committed to working as closely as possible alongside the developers and the District Council to achieve a satisfactory design. Where public input is invited, the Parish Council will do its best to promote this and encourage all members of the public to take part.

---

### **Key issue 7: accommodation for older people**

One respondent expressed concern about the above average number of older persons in the area and wanted more commentary on the availability of bungalows in order to guide current and future demands.

Parish Council's response: The Ardleigh Neighbourhood Plan makes bold steps for the older population that go above and beyond the policies of the Local Plan. Bungalows are not specifically identified by Fig 13 because the data used - unfortunately - did not include this house type. Nonetheless, Fig 13 indicates what houses already exist in the area and does not provide a proposed housing mix for new development. In addition, policy HP provides strong support for new houses that include accessibility features like level thresholds, wide doorways and ground-floor bedrooms. Policy HP also provides welcome new support for the creation of ancillary residential accommodation (e.g. granny annexes) throughout all parts of the parish, including outside settlement boundaries. This will provide more housing choice for all residents with support needs, including older people.

### **Key issue 8: designation of space 4 as a Local Green Space**

One online respondent objected to the inclusion of space 4 as a Local Green Space on the basis that the site is not considered to meet the national criteria in the NPPF. It should be noted that the respondent is the landowner of the site.

Parish Council's response: The comments previously made by this respondent (copy at Attachment 10) have been carefully considered and addressed previously by the Parish Council (previous comments at Attachment 11). National criteria for Local Green Spaces are open to discretion and require a judgement to be taken. It is the Parish Council's view that the space does meet the NPPF criteria and the respondent's previous comments have not altered this position. For example, the respondent previously stated "there is no notable interaction or outlook from any civic space within the settlement". The Parish Council does not agree. In their view, there is notable interaction between the space and very important civic spaces in the village, including its recreation ground. This is considered to be well-evidenced by the photographic record. As the Parish Council does not agree with the assessments made by the respondent, they do not consider it necessary or appropriate to remove space 4 from the Plan and are content for it to be considered at examination by the Inspector who will, of course, apply their own discretion.

---

**Key issue 9: Some nominated Local Green Spaces should not have been discounted**

One respondent was concerned that some sites were discounted due to their existing designations and other sites were discounted because they didn't exist yet. The respondent felt the sites should be included to provide another level of protection to the sites.

Parish Council's response: National planning practice guidance provides "if land is already protected by designation, then consideration should be given to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space." Due consideration was given to this guidance during the desktop phase of assessments. For those spaces already designated as SSSIs - e.g. Bullock Wood - the only tangible benefit of a Local Green Space designation would be to provide some additional control over development in its setting. Given the scale, layout and position of these sites (i.e. with multiple, varied settings on different sides) and the established presence of suburban development in their settings, this was not considered to be especially necessary or, indeed, achievable. Unfortunately, the Parish Council has also been advised that it is not possible to designate Local Green Spaces that do not yet exist. However, they fully recognise the considerable importance - for landscape, biodiversity, social cohesion, public health etc. - that the planned new reservoir (space 16) will hold once complete and do intend to review its designation at that time.

---

**Key issue 10: More emphasis on protection of the rural environment**

One respondent felt there could have been more emphasis on resisting the despoiling of Ardleigh's rural environment, in particular the proposed substation and pylons.

Parish Council's response: The Plan does include ambitious policies for the protection of Ardleigh's rural environment. For example, policy EP resists any development that would have an urbanising effect on a rural lane or street and any development that would cause urban intrusion (including by way of noise, light pollution or increased traffic) into currently tranquil rural areas. The Plan also adopts the Village Design Statement (VDS) into policy. The VDS is a pre-existing document that was recently updated to address development undertaken in the parish in the c. 10 years since its initial publication. The VDS clearly identifies the character (built and landscape) of different parts of the parish - for example, is it rural and tranquil? All new development in the area will now be expected - in accordance with policy EP - to pay due regard to the VDS. This will require respect to be shown for the environment's established qualities and features.



---

## Other consultation responses

In addition to the consultation responses submitted via the online form, the Parish Council received written representations from the following parties:

- National Highways;
- Lichfields (developers of the Garden Community);
- Natural England;
- Colchester Borough Council;
- Crockleford Heath and Elmstead Action Group;
- Essex County Council;
- Essex County Fire and Rescue Service;
- A local resident and landowner; and
- Tendring District Council.

A summary of each party's consultation response appears in the tables below, accompanied by the comments of the Parish Council. Wherever an alteration has been made to the Plan, this is clearly indicated in the Parish Council's comments.

Complete copies of the written representations are attached separately as follows:

**Attachment 1** - National Highways

**Attachment 2** - Lichfields (developers of the Garden Community);

**Attachment 3** - Natural England;

**Attachment 4** - Colchester Borough Council;

**Attachment 5** - Crockleford Heath and Elmstead Action Group;

**Attachment 6** - Essex County Council;

**Attachment 7** - Essex County Fire and Rescue Service;

**Attachment 8** - Local resident and landowner; and

**Attachment 9** - Tendring District Council.

---

### **Natural England**

Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.

However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.

Parish Council's response: The Neighbourhood Plan includes ambitious policies concerned with the appropriate conservation and enhancement of the natural environment in line with the enclosed annex. No change required.

---

## National Highways

Policy TP which identifies opportunities for traffic mitigation measures and public realm improvements, including road junctions' improvement and implementation of sustainable transport measures, and traffic calming measures will be acceptable in principle.

We welcome any initiative which leads to introduce of walking, cycling, and any other sustainable scope of travel, following the Policy CP1 and traffic mitigation in line with the policy intended to enhance the active travel environment where appropriate.

National Highways offers No Objection to this Neighbourhood Plan.

Parish Council's response: The comments of National Highways are appreciated and the Parish Council is pleased that they have no objection to the Plan. No changes to the Plan required.

---

## Colchester Borough Council

There are a number of insert maps within the Neighbourhood Plan (NP), however it would be useful to have an overarching Policy Map which brings these all together.

For context it would be helpful to see a map identifying where the new Garden Community is to be located and showing where it overlaps with the Ardleigh NP area. It may be beneficial to highlight existing routes between the two communities and also consider potential new routes (especially routes that encourage non-vehicular use such as bridleways/cyclepaths).

Parish Council's response: The reason the policy maps have been arranged in their chosen format is because the parish has a very large area. It is not therefore possible to accurately plot all relevant features (such as Local Green Spaces) on one map as the scale is prohibitive. The use of multiple maps ensures the position and boundaries of each Local Green Space are clear and limits the potential for confusion or dispute. No change required.

A map showing the (current) broad location of the Garden Community appears at Fig 2 on page 10 of the Plan. As the design of the Garden Community (including its exact form and boundaries etc.) is the subject of a separate and emerging Development Plan Document, it would not be appropriate for the Neighbourhood Plan to attempt to establish this. No change required.

4.12 states that over the plan period, housing growth in Ardleigh is expected to be limited to small- scale “infill” developments of 10 houses or fewer to be located within the defined Settlement Development Boundaries. There is very little opportunity within the defined Settlement Development Boundaries for infill developments so on this basis little to no development will occur.

Parish Council's response: The housing growth/targets/approach identified at paragraph 4.12 (now 4.14) are based on the strategic policies and provisions of the Local Plan, specifically Sections 3.3.1.4, 3.3.2 & 3.3.3. Whilst it is the case that this means little development will occur in Ardleigh over the plan period, this is also in accordance with the District-level spatial strategy which anticipates only development that is “modest” in scope and scale to come forward in Ardleigh. No change required.

---

It should be noted that part of Spring Valley Lane, a protected lane, falls within the boundary of the Garden Community draft plans.

Parish Council's response: The Neighbourhood Plan has not provided any new or additional protection or designations to Spring Valley Lane. It has been designated as a Protected Lane by the County Council and the developers of the forthcoming Garden Community will need to take this into account. The Neighbourhood Plan would have no bearing on this. No change required.

Fig 28 Settlement Boundary Map doesn't reflect the current housing within the boundary. Map 2 in Appendix A reflects the current development level much more accurately and should be used as the basis of all similar maps within the NP.

Parish Council's response: The settlement development boundaries for Ardleigh have been established by the District Council as part of their Plan and do not necessarily reflect the extent of housing. Rather, they are a planning tool used to direct new development. It would not be appropriate for the Neighbourhood Plan to seek to undermine or revise the settlement development boundaries set by the Local Plan. No change required.

As stated in the explanatory text, Ardleigh Surgery does not have spare capacity and the school is over capacity and likely to remain in the near future therefore it is likely a financial contribution for all housing applications will be requested.

Parish Council's response: If the school and surgery in Ardleigh remain over-subscribed, it will be essential that new development in the area makes a suitable and proportionate financial contribution towards its improvement and retention. The Neighbourhood Plan policy seeks to ensure this in the important interests of social cohesion and public health and well-being. The local community has been understandably vocal about the pressures facing these essential and valued local services and the Neighbourhood Plan has duly taken these local concerns and aspirations on board. No change required.

The creation of ancillary accommodation (such as Granny Annexes) does not count as additional housing stock so should not be contained within the housing policy.

---

Parish Council's response: Although ancillary accommodation may not count as housing stock, it is still a form of residential accommodation and the housing policy is considered the most appropriate and logical place for it. No change required.

Paragraph 11.11 Conflicts with paragraph 4.6 which states no housing from the Garden Community is expected to be delivered within the Ardleigh NP plan area within the plan period.

Parish Council's response: Paragraph 11.11 refers to the substantial number of new homes due to be delivered within the Garden Community over the plan period. Paragraph 4.6 (now 4.8) states the Garden Community is not expected to deliver homes in Ardleigh parish until after the plan period. These comments are both accurate as - at the time of writing - it is expected that the Garden Community will be built out from the south first, with new houses unlikely to be constructed in Ardleigh parish until after 2033. No change required.

#### Policy TP – Transport and Parking

The key objectives and principles for the Garden Community are to ensure neighbourhoods are walkable, low traffic and liveable, where residents can access most of their daily needs within a 15- 20 minute walk or bike ride from their home. The Garden Community will be designed and built in a way that reduces the need to travel, especially by car. With this in mind the Garden Community should not result in increased traffic congestion on existing roads into Ardleigh.

Parish Council's response: Comments on how the Garden Community relates to policy TP are acknowledged. A small change has been made to this policy following comments from other interested parties - more on this elsewhere.

---

## Crockleford Heath and Elmstead Action Group

Section 4.6 It is important this neighbourhood plan makes reference to the garden community and aims to meet the requirements of the garden community while taking note of the views of current residents of the garden community area within Ardleigh Parish and in particular in Crockleford Heath.

*[Other comments are made regarding sections 5.73, 11.11 and 15.8. All comments refer to the need for the Garden Community to consider and safeguard the rural hamlet character of Crockleford Heath]*

Parish Council's response: The Parish Council acknowledges and appreciates the strong desire of local residents and action groups to preserve the special character of Crockleford Heath during and beyond development of the garden community. However, the Parish Council must also reiterate that the initial design and delivery of the garden community is formally outside the remit of this Neighbourhood Plan. Instead, it will be subject to a separate Development Plan Document (draft in progress) prepared by Tendring District Council and its partners as opposed to the Parish Council. Because of this, the Neighbourhood Plan is very limited regarding what it can confirm or dictate for the garden community.

However, the Parish Council is committed to working alongside Tendring District Council, the garden community developers and partners to the best of its ability. The parties responsible for the Development Plan Document (DPD) have confirmed to the Parish Council that the draft DPD includes the identification of an "Area of Special Character" at and around the settlement of Crockleford Heath, aimed at safeguarding its distinctive rural character.

The Parish Council agrees it would be appropriate to acknowledge this clearly-stated design intention in the policy context section of the Neighbourhood Plan. To this end, the following alterations have been made to the Plan (new text appears in bold, removed text is struck through):

---

4.5. The **initial design and delivery** of the Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community - including its nature, form, boundaries and exact housing numbers - will be the subject of a Strategic Growth Development Plan Document (DPD), prepared jointly by Colchester and Tendring Councils. This DPD, currently in draft form, was subject to public consultation between March and April of 2022. At the time of writing, the partner councils were in the process of reviewing the consultation responses and evidence base and making amendments to the draft plan, with a final version anticipated for further public consultation in late 2022 - early 2023. Formal adoption of the DPD is on track to take place in 2023. **Following delivery, new sites in the Ardleigh Parish area of the Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community will be expected to comply with the development plan in force at that time, including any relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies.**

4.6 The Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community DPD, currently in draft form, was subject to public consultation between March and April of 2022. The draft DPD includes the identification of an “Area of Special Character” at and around the settlement of Crockleford Heath, aimed at safeguarding its distinctive rural character.

4.7. At the time of writing, the partner councils were in the process of reviewing the consultation responses and evidence base and making amendments to the draft DPD, with a final version anticipated for further public consultation in late 2022 - early 2023. Formal adoption of the DPD is on track to take place in 2023.

4.6: 4.8 Ardleigh Parish Council intends to work closely and proactively with the partner councils to progress the design and development of the Garden Community. However, this major project is still in its earliest phases and is not anticipated to start delivering new homes in Ardleigh Parish until after the current Local and Neighbourhood Plan period (to 2033) has expired.



---

## Essex County Council

The following wording should be an addition to the planning context section.

“Most areas of the Neighbourhood Plan area are within a Mineral Safeguarding Area due to the presence of sand and gravel deposits beneath the ground. These areas are subject to a minerals safeguarding policy (Policy S8 of the Essex Minerals Local Plan), which seeks to prevent deposits being unnecessarily sterilised by non-mineral development. However, the housing allocations contained in the Neighbourhood Plan fall below the site size threshold at which the provisions of Policy S8 are engaged.”

The following wording should be an addition to the planning context section.

“Within the Neighbourhood Plan Area there are Mineral and/ or Waste Consultation Areas in relation to Crown Quarry, Martells Quarry, Slough Farm and Ardleigh Waste Transfer Station. These areas are subject to Policy S8 of the MLP which establishes Mineral Consultation Areas at a distance of 250m around permitted, allocated and existing mineral infrastructure, and/ or Policy 2 of the Waste Local Plan which establishes Waste Consultation Areas at a distance of 250m (400m in the case of Water Recycling Centres) around permitted, allocated and existing waste infrastructure. Essex County Council as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority must be consulted on all applications for non-minerals and non-waste development proposed within these areas.”.

Parish Council's response: The Neighbourhood Plan makes clear at paragraph 4.1 that both the Essex Minerals Local Plan and the Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan form part of the Development Plan for Ardleigh.

It is not considered necessary to copy specific policies from the aforementioned plans into the Ardleigh Neighbourhood Plan as it is preferred that developers consider the comprehensive policies of these plans in their full written context.

In addition, the Local Plan (Section 2) already includes similar discussion of the EMLP and WLP at paragraphs 1.3.4.2 - 1.3.4.6. No change required.

## Policy GDP

ECC as the MWPA welcome reference to the importance of sustainability throughout the NP, however it is recommended that Policy GPD, which addresses the general approach to development, should support a wider understanding of sustainability by requiring development proposals to make reference to the sustainable use of building materials.

It is recommended that this policy (or perhaps another suitable policy in the NP) includes reference to promoting waste reduction, re-use and recycling, sustainable building design and the use of sustainable materials, including in relation to their procurement, in the construction of new development or redevelopment in line with Policy S4 of the MLP.

Parish Council's response: Policy GDP is intended to supplement and support the broad spatial policies of the Local Plan, particularly policies SPL1 and SPL2 of Section 2. It is therefore mainly a locational policy and is not intended to cover development management issues such as sustainable design/construction.

Concerning sustainable design/construction, this is considered to be appropriately addressed by policies HP and EP which provide, respectively, as follows:

- Housing applications that include sustainable design and construction features in excess of minimum policy requirements will be looked on more favourably than those that do not; and
- Exceptional support is provided for any development that, in the view of the Parish Council, will secure material benefits for the natural, built and/or historic environment\*.

\*This provision is deliberately open-ended to enable the Parish Council to consider a wide range of material benefits on a case-by-case basis including, of course, sustainability and environmental benefits.

No change required.

## Policy HP

ECC are supportive of Policy HP 3b which states housing applications that include accessibility features will be looked at more favourably than those that do not. To support ageing in place, the needs of adults and children with disabilities and the prevention and maximising independence ambitions, ECC recommend that the NP strengthens its position in part 3b of the policy by making specific reference to both the Building Regulations Part M4 (2) and M4 (3) and the Tendring Local Plan Housing Standards Policy:

“On housing developments of 10 or more dwellings, 10% of market housing should be to Building Regulations Part M4(2) ‘adaptable and accessible’ standard. For affordable homes, 10% should be to Building Regulations Part M4(2) and 5% should be to Part M4(3) ‘wheelchair-user’ standards (Ref. Tendring District Housing Viability Assessment 12 May 2017).”

Parish Council’s response: ECC’s recommendation to reference Building Regulations Part M4 (2) and M4 (3) and the Tendring Local Plan Housing Standards Policy has been carefully considered. Ultimately, the Parish Council has opted not to make a change to this policy provision for the following reason:

The reference to “accessibility features” is deliberately vague and open-ended to enable the Parish Council to consider a wide range of proposed features on a case-by-case basis. The Parish Council has made efforts to limit technical/specialist language and planning jargon throughout the Plan in order to make it as accessible and genuinely useful to as wide a range of potential developers - including typical homeowners - as possible. Rather than directing readers to consider other technical planning and construction documents, the policy provides clear examples of common accessibility features of which the average business or homeowner is likely to be aware. It is felt that the policy, as worded, is more likely to encourage the inclusion of accessibility features in new developments in the Parish. No change required.

---

## Policy TP

It is also recommended, given the requirements around parking in Policy TP, this policy sets out a requirement that for any Part M4(3) homes parking also needs to be Part M compliant, i.e., 3.3m or capable of being widened. As a minimum, the number of spaces provided to this standard should reflect the number of Part M4(3) dwellings provided at any development.

Parish Council's response: Part M4(3) homes are specifically wheelchair user dwellings and an optional standard. Given the spatial strategy for this lowest-tier settlement, it is highly unlikely that a significant number of Part M4(3) homes would be brought forward over the plan period. It is not therefore considered necessary to make specific provision for this in a Neighbourhood Plan policy. However, the Parish Council will consider any applications specifically for Part M4(3) homes on their individual merits. If applicants expect material positive weight to be given in the planning balance to the provision of highly accessible housing in accordance with Part M4(3) of the Building Regulations then all relevant criteria (including with respect to parking) will need to be met. No change required.

ECC as the lead authority on education make the following points. Paragraph 11.8 states that the primary school is “*unable to withstand any further material expansion of [the] housing stock*”. Similarly, paragraph 11.13 describes Ardleigh St Mary's Primary School as “*being at breaking point*”. These statements contradict paragraph 10.14 which correctly states that the primary school is “*likely to remain at or close to capacity*”. The primary school has an excellent record of meeting the needs of the local population in high birth years and, as of May 2022, 47.8% of the pupils on roll lived closer to other schools i.e., the result of new housing would likely be that fewer pupils from outside the Priority Admission Area would gain a place. ECC recommend that the aforementioned wording is omitted from paragraph 11.8 and 11.13.

---

Parish Council's response: The pressure facing these local services was a matter raised consistently by the local community throughout the consultation processes of the Neighbourhood Plan. Given the degree of local concern expressed, the Parish Council entered into discussions with the LPA, Tendring District Council, concerning how this matter could best be addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan. On the advice of the LPA, the Parish Council conducted research into the most recent formal positions of the two services - GP surgery and primary school - concerning their capacity. This research found as follows:

In a written publication dated June 2020, the NHS (North East Essex) reported that the Ardleigh Surgery had a spare capacity of -207.29 m<sup>2</sup> NIA, i.e. a deficit of space.

In a written publication dated January 2020, the primary school indicated there were 113 pupils on roll compared to 105 school places, i.e. an oversubscription.

Based on this most recent evidence (at the time of the Plan's preparation) it is accurate to state at para 11.8 that the village's services are currently unable to withstand any material expansion of its housing stock. The spatial strategy established by the Local Plan and bolstered by the Neighbourhood Plan does not anticipate a material expansion of the local housing stock\* and so this is unproblematic.

\*although the Garden Community is unlikely to deliver new housing in Ardleigh Parish until after the current plan period, any new housing would be supported by its own services and facilities and would not be reliant on already stretched village facilities.

Paragraph 11.13 provides discussion of the community consultation. It states that local residents "widely agreed" the school and GP surgery to be at breaking point. This is an accurate reflection of the community's expressed views.

Paragraph 10.14 states the primary school is currently overcapacity and likely to remain at or close to capacity in the near future. The purpose of this statement is to make clear that the pressures facing the primary school are chronic rather than acute. It is accurate to state that the primary school is unlikely to resolve its capacity issues in the near future.

No changes required.

---

ECC as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) recommends that Policy HP reference the issue of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). All new developments should incorporate SuDS, including rainwater harvesting, grey-water recycling etc to mitigate surface water flood risk. Further, all minor developments should manage runoff off using porous surfaces or otherwise discharge from the site should be limited to 1-year greenfield rates or 1 l/s, whichever is greater. There should also be the inclusion of SuDS drainage solutions to provide treatment to runoff generation from all new developments. Reference could also be made to relevant policy in the Tendring District Council Section 2 Local Plan. ECC recommend the promotion of multifunctional space, biodiversity and amenity space with a combination of blue and green features. All new developments should comply with the [Essex SuDS Design Guide](#).

Parish Council's response: The Parish Council has made efforts, wherever possible, to avoid the repetition of provisions already clearly established by the Local Plan. Policy LP 4 of the Local Plan (part 2) requires all new residential and mixed use developments to manage surface water by means of SuDS unless there is an exceptional case not to do so. Policy PPL 5 also requires new development to include SuDS and provides useful detail about the approach to be taken to water quality, conservation, disposal etc. These policies are considered to address SuDS in appropriate detail and a Neighbourhood Plan policy would only unnecessarily repeat them.

Regarding blue and green features, the Neighbourhood Plan is considered to make appropriate provision for these. For example, green and blue roofs appear in the list of desirable features in the supporting text to policy EP. Part 2 of policy EP also provides exceptional support for developments that secure material benefits for the natural and/or built environment of Ardeigh. This could include, for example, material benefits for sustainable water drainage, water conservation etc.

---

The NP should consider, apply and reference the [Essex Green Infrastructure Strategy \(2020\)](#) and the [Essex Green Infrastructure Standards \(2022\)](#), which are relevant to all Essex local authorities. These documents champion the enhancement, protection, and creation of an inclusive and integrated network of green spaces. Applying Essex's nine Green Infrastructure (GI) principles will help to ensure quality and consistency in the provision, management, and stewardship of GI an essential part of place-making and place-keeping for the benefit of people and wildlife.

Parish Council's response: The Neighbourhood Plan includes ambitious policies for local green infrastructure, with the inclusion of a Local Green Spaces policy supported by an extensive evidence base. The Local Green Spaces policy will make a material and welcome contribution towards Essex's GI principles. The Parish Council will carefully monitor and review the Plan's contribution towards the [Essex Green Infrastructure Strategy \(2020\)](#) and the [Essex Green Infrastructure Standards \(2022\)](#) at appropriate intervals throughout the plan period.

It is recommended that the following points are included as part of Policy EP - "including tree planting" at provision xi; "there should also be no net loss of biodiversity" at provision b; this includes 10% biodiversity net gain for applicable new developments in line with the Environment Act 2021 at provision e; Multifunctional green space should be incorporated throughout the area, where appropriate, and be evenly distributed in order to offer maximum benefit to the community.

Parish Council's response: provision xi is deliberately open-ended to allow a wide range of biodiversity efforts to be considered, depending on the context. Local policy PPL 4 adopts the following position RE biodiversity: *Proposals for new development should be supported by an appropriate ecological assessment. Where new development would harm biodiversity or geodiversity, planning permission will only be granted in exceptional circumstances, where the benefits of the development demonstrably outweigh the harm caused and where adequate mitigation or, as a last resort, compensation measures are included, to ensure a net gain, in biodiversity*

The alterations suggested by ECC could be understood to undermine or conflict with the approach advocated by Local Plan policy PPL 4. The Parish Council will await changes to the Local Plan in accordance with the Environment Act before making any amends of their own.

---

## Policy LGP

The wording of Part 2 of the policy is considered ambiguous and it is recommended for review to ensure it achieves its intended outcome. The explanatory text provides some clarity of what is intended and relevant points should be included in the policy itself, otherwise 'development' could be open to interpretation.

Parish Council's response: The use of the term "development" is considered to be most appropriate here and - given the range of local green spaces proposed and variety of development that *could* be appropriate to each - it would not be helpful to attempt to narrow this down further. Part 2 of the policy makes it clear that development will only be supported if it both (a) is compatible with the character/use of the space and (b) preserves the special values/significance of the space. This is worded similarly to other national and local policies concerned with the protection of natural/historic/built assets. For example, paragraph 197 of the NPPF refers to "the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness." It does not attempt to specify what "developments" or what "local character" as this should be determined on a case by case basis.

## Policy TP: Transport & Parking

It is noted that the NP makes little/no reference to the promotion of improved bus services and infrastructure.

Parish Council's response: The Neighbourhood Plan is realistic about what is achievable in Ardleigh and reflects, as far as possible, local aspirations for travel. In recent years, as for most rural areas, bus services have been scaled back and withdrawn from Ardleigh and there is no evidence at all to suggest this trend will cease or reverse. If the County Council believes there is scope for bus services to be returned to Ardleigh, the Parish Council would welcome these discussions with a view to updating the Plan on its next review. Notwithstanding this, community consultation revealed little local appetite for improved bus services, with new and improved cycle and footways being the clear priority of residents. The policy reflects this.



---

Additionally, the NP makes no reference to electric vehicle charging (EVC) points alongside parking. ECC suggests reference is included regarding the provision of EVC infrastructure. Provision for electric charging points should be provided for all proposed car parking spaces, associated within residential development proposals as set out in the latest government guidance and standards.

Parish Council's response: It is understood the requirement for EVC points is not yet in force (from 2023) and so it may be premature to include this in the Plan. Provision 6 of policy TP has been reworded to ensure compliance is demonstrated with the Essex Parking Standards and the Essex Design Guide **and subsequent revisions and replacement guidance**. It is assumed these county-wide documents will be updated as necessary to reflect changes to national guidance and standards.

ECC recommends reference is made safe direct walking and cycling routes to Ardleigh St Mary's Primary School since it fronts the A137. Further guidance is provided within the ECC [Local and Neighbourhood Planners' Guide to School Organisation](#) (January 2018), Section 6 (page 12) including establishing and improving walking and cycling routes to schools; reducing school run traffic and dispersing it away from school entrances; enforcing low traffic speeds around schools and the walking routes pupils use; ensuring pavements around schools are clear and wide enough for parents with pushchairs to pass; providing public art, nature areas and local history information boards, in the immediate area, to offer learning opportunities; planting of trees and / or hedges to enhance air quality / reduce exposure to poor air quality; and the use of landscaping and carefully selected street materials to reduce noise

Parish Council's response: The primary school adopts a highly sustainable location at the heart of the village where it is accessible to most residents of the village via continuous, lit pavements. Vehicle speeds are generally lower around the school due to the presence of traffic controls, road markings and bus stops. The main pressure facing the school is with regard to space/capacity and this is duly addressed by the Plan. In terms of accessibility and travel, the school is also amongst the most accessible and sustainable services in the Parish. Whilst the Parish Council will enthusiastically support proposals to enhance walking and cycling routes to the school, this has not been a focus of the Neighbourhood Plan for the reasons given above.

---

### Green Infrastructure (GI)

A new policy could be included recognising the value of wider multi-functional GI for both people and wildlife, which can improve connectivity to existing and new green spaces, and which provide new open space.

Parish Council's response: A considerable portion of the time and funds spent on the Neighbourhood Plan has been channelled towards the creation of the Local Green Spaces policy which contains ambitious provisions for valuable green infrastructure throughout the parish. Following the community consultation, the need to protect/enhance existing (and especially currently non-designated) important green spaces was prioritised for this first iteration of the Plan. The Parish Council intends to review the efficacy of this policy and investigate how else green infrastructure can be promoted, protected and enhanced in the parish throughout their monitoring of the Plan.

### Climate change

The NP does not include a policy on climate change. NPPF (2021), paragraph 153 requires Plans to take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating from rising temperatures.

Parish Council's response: Although there is no single policy specifically concerned with climate change, climate change is addressed - to some extent - in most Plan policies. For example -

- Policy GDP supports the replacement of dwellings where this would improve energy efficiency and sustainability. It also provides support for development in the countryside that is modest in scale and impact and directly provides for the conservation, enhancement or appropriate enjoyment of the countryside. That could include, for example, schemes with positive implications for climate change such as new hedgerow planting or community food growing schemes etc..
- Policy CFP provides support for new community facilities in accessible locations and resists the loss of established important and accessible village facilities, with a view to creating a more walkable community with less need for travel by car;

- 
- Policy HP provides additional support for dwellings boasting sustainable design and construction features in excess of policy requirements. It also provides support for multigenerational living (attached annexes for family members) which will ensure the best possible use is made of existing residential sites to meet local housing needs
  - Policy EP provides exceptional support for developments that would secure material benefits for the natural and built environment of Ardleigh including, for example, by reducing reliance on fossil fuels. Policy EP also promotes the use of natural/local/traditional building materials in new development which generally have less embodied carbon than modern alternatives
  - Policy LGP provides welcome support for Local Green Spaces, most of which make material positive contributions to local biodiversity, local wildlife habitats, land drainage, food production etc.
  - Policy TP provides support for new and improved sustainable travel routes, including cycle and walkways.

## Essex County Fire and Rescue Service

Essex County Fire and Rescue Service would ask that the following are considered during the continued development of the Ardleigh Parish Neighbourhood Plan:

- Use of community spaces as a hub for our Prevention teams to deliver Fire Safety and Education visits, with the shared use of an electric charging point.
- Adherence to the requirements of the Fire Safety Order and relevant building regulations, especially approved document B.
- Installation of smoke alarms and/or sprinkler systems at suitably spaced locations throughout each building.
- Implementation of **vision zero** principles where there are introductions of or changes to the road network.
- Appropriate planning and mitigations to reduce risks around outdoor water sources.
- Suitable principles in design to avoid deliberate fire setting.
- Consideration for road widths to be accessible whilst not impeding emergency service vehicle response through safe access routes for fire appliances including room to manoeuvre (such as turning circles).
- Implementation of a transport strategy to minimise the impact of construction and prevent an increase in the number of road traffic collisions. Any development should not negatively impact on the Service's ability to respond to an incident in the local area.
- A risk reduction strategy to cover the construction and completion phases of the project.

Parish Council's response: Whilst the comments appear to relate to a specific project or development rather than the Neighbourhood Plan as a whole, the Parish Council acknowledges the general thrust of Essex County Fire and Rescue Service's consultation response which is - broadly speaking - that efforts to improve fire safety and resilience should be made wherever possible. To this end, the following iteration has been made to policy HP (new text appears in bold):

3. In all circumstances, housing applications that include the following features will be looked on more favourably than those that do not: [...]

**c. Measures to improve fire safety and resilience in excess of minimum policy requirements**

## Local resident and landowner (owner of proposed Local Green Space 5)

[summarised]

- The proposal to designate space 5 as a Local Green Space is flawed
- The report states the land is currently undesignated which is wrong as it's part of a licensed premises, Prettyfields vineyard
- Encouraging the public to come to a wedding venue to enjoy the view could be provocative
- The wording in the description that you can access the area "via" the footpath insinuates the area is a destination - but that is only the case for paying customers
- The site is used by Colchester Aero modellers and to encourage the public to use it would be contrary to the thoughts of the council when they refused consent for the club to use the land as a public playing field because their model aircraft could pose a danger to others on the playing field
- Requests the site is deleted as a Local Green Space before usage gets worse than it is now. Notes Ardleigh Reservoir Committee have put in a car park without permission

Parish Council's response: When the Parish Council says the land is undesignated, they are referring to natural/landscape designations such as AONBs, County Wildlife Sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest. The description of the site's use makes it clear that it is occupied by Prettyfields vineyard.

Both the Local Green Spaces Assessment document and the Plan itself make it clear that public access is only possible along the public footpaths, with access to the vineyard requiring paid entry.

Designation of the space is not anticipated to materially alter use of the site. Trespassing has not been encouraged and all development currently requiring planning consent will continue to be subject to the same consents.

The Parish Council would like to make it clear that they are supportive of the existing use of the relevant part of the site as a working vineyard as this is very much compatible with the special value of the site as a whole. The Parish Council expects the proposed designation of this space will be to the material benefit of this established rural land-based business as it provides additional resistance to development in its vicinity that would not be compatible with its character.

---

The Parish Council would also encourage the landowner to report potential breaches of planning control in the area - such as the alleged car park - to the Local Planning Authority via the usual channels. If the site is designated as a Local Green Space, it is anticipated that even greater priority will be given to tackling unauthorised and inappropriate development in its setting.

---

### **Lichfields, developers of the Garden Community**

Paragraph 4.6 of the draft NP explains that the delivery of homes within the TCBGC will not take place until the NP period has expired (up to 2033), which is incorrect. The delivery of homes is currently scheduled to commence as early as 2025/2026 within the garden community allocation.

Parish Council's response: Paragraph 4.6 (now 4.8) states that homes are not expected to be built out in Ardleigh Parish until after the current plan period. Whilst homes are expected to be delivered as early as 2025/6, this is due to take place in other areas not covered by Ardleigh Parish. The developer has confirmed to the Parish Council that this remains their broad intention.

It is important therefore that policies in the emerging draft NP do not attempt to undermine the delivery of the garden community. To minimise this risk, and the risk of draft NP being rejected at examination stage, we would strongly encourage the Parish Council to progress its draft NP alongside the Councils emerging DPD, with a view to creating a complementary plan, rather than advancing it prior to adoption of the DPD.

Parish Council's response: The Plan has been amended to make it clear that the initial design and delivery of the garden community will be subject to its own (emerging) DPD. As there is little anticipated cross-over between the Neighbourhood Plan and the DPD, it is not considered essential that they are progressed together. The Parish Council already delayed their Plan to allow Section 2 of the Local Plan to be adopted first and do not consider it helpful to delay further.

Regarding Crockleford Heath, we understand the desires of some people within the community for no development to occur in its vicinity. However, this is in direct conflict with the strategic allocation in the Section 1 Plan, which anticipates Crockleford Heath forming part of the garden community and as such, change and appropriate development is anticipated. It is Latimer's aspiration that its proposals respect, enhance and reinforce the character of the existing area and strengthen the existing community in Crockleford Heath, and we look forward to ongoing discussions over the coming years as proposals are worked up.

---

Parish Council's response: No part of the Plan resists development of the Garden Community in the Crockleford Heath area and there is not considered to be any policy conflict in this regard. The emerging aspirations for the Crockleford Heath area (per the draft DPD) are acknowledged and it is agreed that it would be appropriate to clearly set these design aspirations out in the Neighbourhood Plan. To this end, the following wording has been added to paragraph 4.6:

**The draft DPD includes the identification of an “Area of Special Character” at and around the settlement of Crockleford Heath, aimed at safeguarding its distinctive rural character.**

Policy GDP: General Approach to Development

Latimer welcomes confirmation at paragraph 9.8 in that the NP does not seek to prevent or discourage any development that is permitted by the Local Plan (i.e. including the TCBGC), however, this is not reflected in the wording of Policy GDP, which does seek to restrict development outside of the settlement boundary. Such policy wording would limit the extent of developable land within the allocated garden community, which would undermine the ability for the allocated garden community to deliver between 7,000 and 9,000 homes. To avoid conflict with the Section 1 Plan, policy should only relate to land both outside of the settlement boundary and outside of the Broad Location for the TCBGC already allocated in the Section 1 Plan.

Parish Council's response: It is agreed that policy GDP could be reworded to make it clearer that the garden community comprises an exception to the general resistance to development outside of settlement boundaries. The following alteration has been made (new text appears in bold):

Policy GDP -

**2. With the exception of the Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community,** new development outside of the Settlement Development Boundaries will not generally be permitted unless it is consistent with all other relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies and [...]



### Policy CFP: Community Facilities

Latimer generally supports the aims of this policy. In relation to criterion 4, relating to proposals resulting in a net addition of housing being required to provide evidence that there is sufficient GP and/or primary school capacity, Latimer confirms that proposals within the garden community will ensure sufficient health, education and other community provision is provided to meet the needs of the new community. This will be a requirement of the DPD in any event and something Latimer is seeking to ensure from the outset to create a successful and thriving place.

Parish Council's response: It is understood that the garden community will be a self-sustaining community, providing sufficient facilities - including health, education etc. - to meet the needs of its residents. Part 4 of the policy relates only to housing applications that generate a "need" for the village's existing GP Surgery and primary school. The housing proposed within the Garden Community would generate no such need.

### Policy HP: Housing

Latimer objects to criterion 1, which conflicts with Section 1 Plan, Policy SP 8 and SP 9. To remedy this, this aspect of the policy should only relate to land both outside of the settlement boundary and outside of the Broad Location for the TCBGC. Latimer additionally object to criterion 3 as the housing mix for the garden community will be informed by the DPD and subsequent planning applications. Latimer is committed to delivering 30% affordable housing provision across the garden community, as required by the adopted Section 1 Plan.

Parish Council's response: Criterion 1 of policy HP requires development to be in accordance with policy GDP. The alteration to policy GDP (to specifically identify the garden community as an exception) ensures policy HP poses no conflict with Section 1 policies SP8 and SP9. Regarding criterion 3, the introductory text makes it clear that the initial design and delivery of the garden community will be subject to its own DPD. It would not, therefore, be expected to comply with the preferred housing mix at policy HP. Notwithstanding this, part 3 is worded to provide additional support for housing applications that include specified features. It would not prevent the approval of applications that failed to include any of the specified features.

---

### Policy EP: Natural, Built & Historic Environment

We object to the inclusion of the TCBGC within this policy and respectfully request that it is specifically excluded from this policy as it directly conflicts with the Section 1 Plan, particularly as all related matters will be addressed within the DPD. Furthermore, detailed design codes will be developed by Latimer in consultation with the Councils, community and other stakeholders to inform future planning applications, all set within the framework of the Councils emerging DPD. Notwithstanding, having reviewed the Village Design Statement (VDS), there are many which are not appropriate for the TCBGC.

In relation to the natural environment, Latimer's intention is to protect and incorporate Public Rights of Ways, hedgerows and mature trees and ancient woodland where practical and appropriate to help integrate the new garden community with the existing area. We look forward to discussing this and other aspects of our proposals in due course.

Parish Council's response: The Plan has been amended to make it clear that the initial design and delivery of the garden community will be subject to its own (emerging) DPD.

Following subsequent discussions with both the garden community developers and TDC, all parties appear to agree that the plan for development within the garden community post-delivery is not yet established. It is not clear, for example, whether the emerging DPD will cover development in the garden community post-delivery, whether a new DPD will be adopted or whether new sites in the community would (once complete) be expected to comply with the development plan in force in the area at that time.

In order to ensure new sites in the garden community retain a Plan-led approach to development at all times, the introductory text of the Neighbourhood Plan now explicitly states as follows:

**Following delivery, new sites in the Ardleigh Parish area of the Tendring/ Colchester Borders Garden Community will be expected to comply with the development plan in force at that time, including any relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies.**

It is anticipated that “relevant” policies of the Neighbourhood Plan would likely include policy EP.

Regarding the Village Design Statement (VDS), this provides an objective appraisal of the current character of each main area of the parish. It is acknowledged that the garden community will alter the character of its host area to the degree that the VDS is unlikely to remain accurate post its completion. In acknowledgement of this, the following alteration has been made to the policy (new wording in bold):

1. Development that is consistent with all other relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies will be supported provided:
  - a. Its design pays due regard to the contents of the Village Design Statement\* [...]

**\*including subsequent revisions and/or subsequent replacement guidance.**

In the event that both of the following should hold true:

1. Sites in the garden community are completed and occupied in Ardleigh Parish over the plan period; and
2. No development plan document is adopted to guide the future development of these sites;

Then it would be expected that the Village Design Statement is updated (or another document prepared) to provide an objective appraisal of the newly established character of the garden community. Sites in the garden community would be expected to demonstrate due regard for the contents of such a document, in accordance with policy EP.

The Parish Council considers it reasonable, appropriate and achievable - in the absence of a replacement/overriding development plan document - that completed sites in the garden community would be expected to comply with all other provisions of policy EP.

#### Policy LGP: Local Green Spaces

As above, the TCBGC should be excluded from this policy as it directly conflicts with the Section 1 Plan and in any event these aspects will be addressed within the DPD and associated strategic masterplan.

Parish Council's response: Policy LGP is concerned only with the individual Local Green Spaces identified in the Plan and adjacent land. It contains no other provisions. All of the individual Local Green Spaces identified in the Plan are located some distance from the area of the Garden Community. The area of the Garden Community contains no Local Green Spaces and nor does it contain any land that could reasonably be considered "adjacent" to them. For these reasons, it is firmly disputed that the policy LGP has any bearing on the Garden Community or presents any conflict with the Section 1 Local Plan.

#### Policy TP: Transport & Parking

Transport and parking are important considerations; however, the Councils may wish to adopt a bespoke approach within the TCBGC to minimise car travel and encourage a modal shift towards more sustainable travel patterns. This will be embedded within the ethos of the new garden community. We therefore object to this policy and respectfully request that the TCBGC is excluded to allow these important matters to be given due consideration as part of the DPD and development management process.

Parish Council's response: Policy TP has been reworded as follows:

- 1. With the exception of the Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community,** development likely to generate significant amounts of movement and/or to have significant transport implications\* will be strictly resisted throughout the parish.

In addition, as set out previously, the Plan's introductory text has also been amended to make it clear that the initial design and delivery of the garden community is subject to its own DPD as opposed to the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Following completion, however, it would be expected that new sites within the garden community have regard to the development plan in force at that time. That could potentially include the Neighbourhood Plan unless it is replaced or superseded in the interim. If it is not superseded, the Parish Council considers it reasonable, appropriate

---

and achievable that completed sites in the garden community would be expected to comply with the provisions of policy TP.

---

## **Tendring District Council, Local Planning Authority**

The District Council continues to raise concerns that the emerging Ardleigh NDP would not be in general conformity with Strategic Policies contained within the adopted Development Plan. In particular policies SP6 and SP9 of the Section 1 Local Plan in relation to the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community.

Prior to Regulation 16 stage, the District Council would need assurance that the emerging policies within the NDP would not conflict with the Strategic Policies contained within the adopted Development Plan.

Parish Council's response: In subsequent discussions, TDC has confirmed to the Parish Council that these broad summary comments relate to more detailed comments issued further in their letter - addressed below.

Paragraphs 4.2 – 4.6 would benefit from additional clarity on the remit of the neighbourhood Plan where it intersects with the DPD. A paragraph explaining that the Policies within this Neighbourhood Plan do not relate to development within the DPD would suffice.

Parish Council's response: Following subsequent discussions with TDC, this section has been reworded to confirm the the initial design and delivery of the Garden Community will be the subject of a separate DPD. However, following delivery, new sites in the Garden Community will be expected to comply with the development plan in force at that time, including any relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies.

The Parish Council believes this is the most appropriate way to approach development of and in the Garden Community. Should the development plan for the Garden Community change over the course of the plan period to exclude the Neighbourhood Plan\*, the policy as reworded would account for this.

\*It has been suggested that the Garden Community may - in future years - form its own parish rather than falling within the remit of Ardleigh Parish (and surrounding parishes). As this is yet to be confirmed, the above alteration to the Neighbourhood Plan ensures the completed Garden Community is not left without a plan-led approach to development in the interim.

Policy GDP (General Approach to Development) and Policy HP (Housing) could be interpreted as not allowing any development outside of defined settlement boundaries in the Neighbourhood Plan Area – notwithstanding the fact that the Garden Community will be developed partly in the Neighbourhood Plan Area, albeit in accordance with parameters to be set by the Development Plan Document (DPD) being prepared by Tendring, Colchester and Essex Councils. The emerging Neighbourhood Plan should be in general conformity with the Development Plan, it needs to clearly and explicitly acknowledge the Garden Community development. The NDP must also explain that a separate policy document (i.e. the DPD) will apply to that development, the emerging Plan is close to achieving this in the above mentioned text. The current wording of the emerging Policies are ambiguous at best and could be read as restrictive at worse; and therefore would not, on a strict reading, be in conformity with the adopted Development Plan. These emerging Policies should be amended to address the above concerns.

Parish Council's response: It is agreed these policies could be clearer regarding the “exception” provided by the garden community. The following alteration has been made (new text appears in bold):

Policy GDP -

**2. With the exception of the Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community,** new development outside of the Settlement Development Boundaries will not generally be permitted unless it is consistent with all other relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies and [...]

Policy HP states that housing development will be resisted outside settlement boundaries unless it is in full compliance with policy GDP. The above alteration to policy GDP ensures policy HP now also takes necessary account of the garden community.

---

Similarly with Policies EP (Natural, Built and Historic Environment) and LGP (Local Green Spaces), whilst it is not clear, these Policies should not aim to prejudice or run counter to the adopted Development Plan and Emerging DPD. The preparation of the DPD is an evolving process working at some speed. We would recommend that the Parish Council fully engage with the joint Councils during this preparation process before the Neighbourhood Plan proceeds to the next stage.

Parish Council's response: The relevant parts of the policy context section (paras. 4.3 - 4.8) now make it very clear that the initial design and delivery of the garden community will be established by the emerging DPD. They also make it clear that, post-delivery, new sites in the garden community will be expected to comply with the development plan in force at that time. This is considered to be a necessary and important provision as it ensures new sites in the garden community are not left without a plan-led approach to development. For this reason, policies EP and LGP do not specifically exclude the garden community or sites within it. This is to protect against the following possibility (example) -

*The garden community makes unexpected progress and houses begin to be built out in Ardleigh Parish before 2033.*

*Houses are built out in accordance with the parameters established by the DPD.*

*Once completed, the homes begin to be occupied.*

*New occupiers start to make changes to their properties requiring planning permission, e.g. new garages, new boundary treatments and other householder alterations.*

*As the DPD only covers the initial design and delivery of the garden community, alterations made to sites subsequent to the creation of the garden community are undertaken without any detailed development management policies to guide them.*

It is also worth stating that none of the spaces proposed by policy LGP are within proximity of the garden community. Development of the garden community would not have any potential to conflict with policy LGP.



---

It is also unclear if Policy TP (Transport and Parking) is intended to apply to development within the Garden Community. If this is the case, it is considered that this policy would not accord with the adopted Development Plan and will need clarification.

Parish Council's response: It is agreed that policy TP could be clearer regarding the garden community. The following alteration has been made (new wording in bold):

**1. With the exception of the Tendring/Colchester Borders Garden Community,** development likely to generate significant amounts of movement and/or to have significant transport implications\* will be strictly resisted throughout the parish.

The Council has started work on defining a character area for Crockleford Heath. This work will feed into the next iteration of the DPD. The Parish Council is encouraged to engage in this work and help with the shaping of this unique area.

Parish Council's response: It is agreed that the ongoing work on the DPD - particularly insofar as it pertains to the character area for Crockleford Heath - warrants further comment in the Plan. To this end, the following wording has been added to paragraph 4.6:

**The draft DPD includes the identification of an “Area of Special Character” at and around the settlement of Crockleford Heath, aimed at safeguarding its distinctive rural character.**

There is a presentation issue on page 32 where the list of green spaces is split over two pages.

Parish Council's response: It is not considered that splitting the list confuses or otherwise affects understanding of this section. The Parish Council has pointed out to TDC that there are various examples of lists split across two pages in their own Local Plan. TDC accepts that no change is required.

Throughout a number of Policies it is required that new development accord with all Policies in the Neighbourhood Plan. As we have mentioned before, this is an unreasonable request and should be amended.

---

Parish Council's response: There is no requirement anywhere in the Plan that new development accord with all policies. Rather, the requirements are worded such that development should accord with all "relevant" policies in the Plan. These provisions are typical and appropriate, appearing in various Local Plan policies, e.g.: policy PP5 states that [various] developments "will be permitted where they comply with other relevant policies in this Local Plan" amongst other provisions.

---

## Conclusion

The Parish Council wishes to express their gratitude to everyone who took the time to comment on the Neighbourhood Plan during the regulation 14 consultation. The resultant alterations to the Plan make for a stronger and more comprehensive document overall of which the local community should be proud.

The Parish Council will now look to submit the Plan for formal examination, during which your views will also be sought and your input gratefully received and taken on board.

---

# Appendix A: notification letter

## Ardleigh Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission Consultation (Regulation 14)

Ardleigh Parish Council wishes to inform you of the above consultation. The details of how to make representations on the Pre-Submission Plan are given below:

- The Plan can be viewed in the following ways:
  - By electronic download from <https://ardleigh.website/our-plan> The wider evidence base and supporting documents can also be viewed and downloaded.
  - Hard Copy:
    - Ardleigh Village Hall, CO7 7RS on 24<sup>th</sup> August, 2 p.m. to 7 pm where members of the Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group will be available to answer questions.
    - In case of difficulty accessing via the above options, please call 01206 414989 or email [ardleighnp@gmail.com](mailto:ardleighnp@gmail.com) to arrange to view a hard copy. (we hope to have a copy available at St Mary's Church, Ardleigh, CO7 7LD from 15<sup>th</sup> August).
- Representations can be made in the following ways:
  - By completing a feedback form available via the web link <https://ardleigh.website/our-plan>
  - By emailing [ardleighnp@gmail.com](mailto:ardleighnp@gmail.com)
  - More information and copies of the feedback form will be available at the drop-in session, 24<sup>th</sup> August, Ardleigh Village Hall 2-7pm
  - By writing to Ardleigh Parish Council, PO Box 12685, Colchester CO7 7EZ
- The Pre-Submission Consultation runs from **8<sup>th</sup> August, to 12 noon on. 23<sup>rd</sup> September, 2022.** No representations will be accepted after this time.
- All representations must include name, address and if relevant, the organisation you are representing.

If you have any questions, please email [ardleighnp@gmail.com](mailto:ardleighnp@gmail.com) or come along to our drop in session on 24 August.

---

## Appendix B: Ardleigh Advertiser advert

**Ardleigh Neighbourhood Plan:** The draft Neighbourhood Plan is now being finalised by our consultants, Planning Direct, and should be returned to the Parish Council by 5th August 2022. Assuming there are no delays, the next stage of the Plan will be to hold a 6-week consultation with the community. The Government set this process - called Regulation 14 Pre-submission Consultation. The Parish Council will publicise the Plan and invite comments on it. All comments will be considered by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and a final version of the Plan will then be submitted to the Local Planning Authority, Tendring District Council, for examination by an independent examiner.

The 6-week Pre-submission consultation will begin on 8th August and end on 16th September 2022. An on-line version of the draft Neighbourhood Plan, with an accompanying comments questionnaire, will be made available on Ardleigh Parish Council Our Plan website link. There will also be a small number of hard copies available for those who cannot access the Plan electronically. Look out for more information on this through social media and posters, which will be placed around the community.

Another **date for your diary** is the 24th August, 2022. Ardleigh Parish Council will be holding another **Information Drop-in session** at the Village Hall, from 2pm until 7pm. The draft Neighbourhood Plan will be available to view, with the Pre-submission consultation questionnaire.

# Appendix C: online consultation form

\* Required

1. Do you support the proposed Neighbourhood Plan for Ardleigh?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe/ not sure

2. Do you have any comments on the proposed Policies within the Plan?

Enter your answer

3. Do you have any other comments on the proposed Neighbourhood Plan?

Enter your answer

4. Please give your name and address below.

If you are representing an organisation please also give the name of the organisation.  
(All representations must be accompanied by a name and address). \*

Enter your answer

Submit

---

## Appendix D - online form responses



Name	Do you support the proposed Neighbourhood Plan for Ardleigh?	Do you have any comments on the proposed Policies within the Plan?	Do you have any other comments on the proposed Neighbourhood Plan?	Parish Council's response
Respondent 1	Yes	Excellent thoroughly agree	A very bit thank you to everyone who has worked so hard on this.	N/A
Respondent 2	Yes	They have been well thought through and reflect the desires of the community.		N/A
Respondent 3	Yes	I support them all.	I know how much work has gone in to the preparation of this plan.	N/A
Respondent 4	Yes	<p>Generally a very clear document, extremely well researched with plenty of opportunity for community involvement in drawing up conclusions and proposals/policies. I am concerned that this document will simply be given lip service by TDC planning department, recent experience on the level of new builds in Ardleigh leads me to believe that their Local Plan target of &lt;1 new property a year is fanciful.</p> <p>On one specific point, the proposed new link road, the document states "The new link road is likely to improve parishioners' ease of access into the urban centre of Colchester", this will only be the case for a very small number of Ardleigh parishioners, only those in the Crockleford Heath area. This benefit is likely to be outweighed by other road users looking for a shortcut to and from the link road.</p>	<p>I am very disappointed that there is not a stronger commitment to developing cycle routeways into Colchester and Manningtree as a means of reducing road traffic as well as promoting a healthier, more sustainable method of personal transport. Cycling is becoming even more accessible to the general public with the continued development of electric bicycles.</p>	<p>Once adopted, Ardleigh Parish Council expects the District Council to give the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan their full statutory weight when making decisions in the area. The Parish Council will continue to comment on applications in their area and anticipate that the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will better support them to resist inappropriate development. The link road is part of the District Plan and the Ardleigh Neighbourhood Plan does not have the power to affect this. However, Ardleigh Parish Council will continue to monitor road issues in the area and would urge parishioners to continue to report their complaints or concerns. The Parish Council is also very keen to promote cycling and other sustainable transport modes throughout the parish, however a Neighbourhood Plan - by its purpose and nature - is limited in what it can achieve. Policy CFP does provide support for new or improved community facilities, especially exercise-related leisure facilities. This could include, for example, new cycleways or other suitable cycling facilities. Policy TP also provides strong support for development that would improve existing cycleways or provide new cycleways.</p>





Respondent 5	Yes	Very Comprehensive	No	N/A
Respondent 6	Yes	A great piece of work and reflects the needs of the village and help to keep its character going forward.	It is vital that the plan is upheld by local and national plans.	Once adopted, Ardleigh Parish Council expects the District Council to give the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan their full statutory weight when making decisions in the area. The Parish Council will continue to comment on applications in their area and anticipate that the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will better support them to resist inappropriate development.
Respondent 7	Yes	Limit the number of houses being proposed		The Neighbourhood Plan does not set any specific housing targets and the strategy of the District Plan is that Ardleigh will sustain only modest housing growth over the plan period. The plan-led approach to development is of vital importance and the Parish Council expects all planning decisions to be made in light of this.
Respondent 8	Yes	I hope there are developments restricted to 10 dwellings		The Neighbourhood Plan does not set any specific housing targets and the strategy of the District Plan is that Ardleigh will sustain only modest housing growth over the plan period. The plan-led approach to development is of vital importance and the Parish Council expects all planning decisions to be made in light of this.
Respondent 9	Yes			N/A
Respondent 10	Yes	If there is any further building in Ardleigh, they should only be small scale developments - the school and surgery are over-subscribed already.		The Ardleigh Neighbourhood Plan recognises the well-evidenced pressures facing the village's key essential services such as the school and GP surgery. It makes bold efforts to protect these cherished and vital local facilities from the negative effects of new development - see policy CFP in particular. Ardleigh Parish Council will pay close attention to the effect and efficacy of these policies during their monitoring of the Plan.

Respondent 11	Yes	I am in total support of the proposed policies.	A lot of hard work has gone into producing this plan. The Parish of Ardleigh stands to benefit hugely when it is adopted	N/A
Respondent 12	Yes	whoever devised the plan clearly put time and effort in to it. Congratulations!		N/A
Respondent 13	Yes			N/A
Respondent 14	Yes			N/A
Respondent 15	Maybe/ not sure		Not sure what the neighbour hood plan is but I'm opposed to any building work, pylons etc	This comment appears to be in relation to an ongoing major planning application for pylons works in the area which has generated a large local response. This is separate to the Neighbourhood Plan and the Parish Council has engaged with the community on this matter independently of the Plan.
Respondent 16	Yes			N/A
Respondent 17	Yes	No	No	N/A
Respondent 18	Yes	This represents a deal of work from many willing volunteers. Thank you.		N/A
Respondent 19	No	Pylons are a blight on the landscape and should not be promoted in this cavalier fashion, There is an alternative route under the sea to Tilbury with a mega reduced environmental impact.		This comment appears to be in relation to an ongoing major planning application for pylons works in the area which has generated a large local response. This is separate to the Neighbourhood Plan and the Parish Council has engaged with the community on this matter independently of the Plan.

Respondent 20	Yes	<p>Seem well thought out and logical. Also aspirational, for instance about the development of communal facilities.</p> <p>It must be made clear that the new town, the design, location and viability of which cannot be subject to Ardeigh policies, must not be allowed to impact the village more than is absolutely necessary.</p>	<p>Again, to do with the new town, how the Plan links into it.</p> <p>How can Ardeigh ensure that Tendring take notice of what villagers want?</p> <p>Query: Manor House Meadow: is this field now in the ownership of Manor House? They have their own meadows. The photo is of the land which used to belong to Bovills Hall</p>	<p>The District Plan establishes that the design of the new garden community will be subject to its own, independent development plan document. Therefore, the Ardeigh Neighbourhood Plan is not able to directly influence its design or location etc. However, the Parish Council is committed to working as closely as possible alongside the developers and the District Council to achieve a satisfactory design. Where public input is invited, the Parish Council will do its best to promote this and encourage all members of the public to take part. Regarding Manor House Meadow - parts of this site are designated Local Wildlife Sites Te9 and Te10, known respectively as "Manor House Meadow" and "Springhead Corner Meadow" - this is where the name was taken from.</p>
		<p>The socio-economic profiles presented clearly demonstrate that there is an above average number of older persons (over the age of 65+) living in Ardeigh compared to levels in England and Essex. This indicates that there is an existing need for specialist older person accommodation in Ardeigh. As individual's care requirements increase, they will inevitably have to move away from Ardeigh to seek accommodation that suits their needs (this type of accommodation isn't just specialist care homes, but single storey living, such as bungalows).</p>	<p>We are pleased to see that the Parish Council has removed reference to the landowner granting permission for the public to walk on the unofficial routes that go beyond the public rights of way.</p> <p>It is assumed that reference to "designating" the land as a Local Green Space as a means to protecting the footpaths (para 13.17) relates purely to the existing PROW. If this is not the case, then clarification is required, because it is wrong to imply that a Neighbourhood Plan designation could in any way claim to allow access to private land.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the inclusion of Space 4: Field south of Mary Warner Estate as Local Green Space as defined in the NPPF continues to be flawed. The Parish Council dismisses Nigel Cowlin's specialist opinions in the December 2021 assessment entitled "Review of proposed Local Green Space designation" without any detailed explanation as to</p>	<p>The Ardeigh Neighbourhood Plan makes bold steps for the older population that go above and beyond the policies of the District Plan. Bungalows are not specifically identified by Fig 13 because the data used - unfortunately - did not include this house type. Nonetheless, Fig 13 indicates what houses already exist in the area and does not provide a proposed housing mix for new development. In addition, policy HP provides strong support for new houses that include accessibility features like level thresholds, wide doorways and ground-floor bedrooms. Policy HP also provides welcome new support for the creation of ancillary residential accommodation (e.g. granny annexes) throughout all parts of the parish, including outside settlement boundaries. This will provide more housing choice for all residents with support needs, including older people. Unless clearly stated, any reference to a footpath is a reference to a formally designated Public Right of Way (PROW). The comments previously made by Mr Cowlin have been carefully considered and addressed previously. National criteria</p>



Respondent 21	No	The housing types breakdown in Fig 13 does not identify bungalows. It would be beneficial if this information was presented in the plan so that the important distinction between the numbers of two storey family housing and single storey bungalows can be made. As presented, bungalows are hidden as they cross over the detached, semi-detached and terraced categories and yet, they provide a specialist type of accommodation that the population statistics show is needed now as well as in the future. This information will help guide the Parish Council as to current and future demands for this particular type of housing. We recommend this change is made to the plan prior to submission to the LPA.	why. In essence, Space 4 does not meet the criteria for what constitutes Local Green Space as set out in the NPPF and so, we maintain that this designation should be removed from the Neighbourhood Plan submitted for examination.  We consider that as written, the Neighbourhood Plan does not meet the "basic conditions" as it will not have due regard to National Policy (i.e. it does not meet the NPPF definition of Local Green Space as explained in the December 2021 Nigel Cowlin Assessment) and that the Independent Examiner will not be in a position to recommend that the plan proceed to the referendum stage. This will cause delay to the "adoption" of the Neighbourhood Plan and the Parish Council is advised to make this change now to avoid such delay.	for Local Green Spaces are open to discretion and require a judgement to be taken. It is the Parish Council's view that the space does meet the NPPF criteria and the comments of [REDACTED] have not altered this position. For example, [REDACTED] stated "there is no notable interaction or outlook from any civic space within the settlement". The Parish Council does not agree. In their view, there is notable interaction between the space and very important civic spaces in the village, including its recreation ground. This is considered to be well-evidenced by the photographic record. As the Parish Council does not agree with the assessments made by [REDACTED], they do not consider it necessary or appropriate to remove space 4 from the Plan and are content for it to be considered at examination by the Inspector who will, of course, apply their own discretion.
Respondent 22	Yes	A sound solution to labour over development of the village.	It meets requirements, has been thoughtfully developed for the benefit of the environment and the community living in the village.	N/A
Respondent 23	Yes			N/A
Respondent 24	Yes			N/A
Respondent 25	Yes			N/A
Respondent 26	Yes			N/A
Respondent 27	Yes	Agree with them all - well thought out, comprehensively described and should hopefully protect Ardleigh in the coming years from unwanted development.	A great document, well prepared, well presented. Thank you to everyone involved in putting in the hard work and research to prepare the NP	N/A

			<p>Congratulations on your thorough 'Local Green Space Assessment'. CNHS is concerned however that some sites are being "discounted" from inclusion on the grounds that they are already protected. Examples are Bullock Wood, Churn Wood. Another, a new reservoir with green space, is being discounted as it does not yet exist. CNHS would not "discount" any site that has benefit to biodiversity and hence wildlife protection and enhanced health and well-being to the community. Such sites should be included so that your neighbourhood plan adds another level of 'material' policies to protect those sites. Please do not allow any dilution to protection of sensitive sites.</p>	<p>National planning practice guidance provides "if land is already protected by designation, then consideration should be given to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space." Due consideration was given to this guidance during the desktop phase of assessments. For those spaces already designated as SSSIs - e.g. Bullock Wood - the only tangible benefit of a Local Green Space designation would be to provide some additional control over development in its setting. Given the scale, layout and position of these sites (i.e. with multiple, varied settings on different sides) and the established presence of suburban development in their settings, this was not considered to be especially necessary or, indeed, achievable. Unfortunately, the Parish Council has also been advised that it is not possible to designate Local Green Spaces that do not yet exist. However, they fully recognise the considerable importance - for landscape, biodiversity, social cohesion, public health etc. - that the planned new reservoir (space 16) will hold once complete and do intend to review its designation at that time.</p>
Respondent 28	Maybe/ not sure			
Respondent 29	Yes	<p>I hope that when the parish is threatened with new developments (housing or business), TDC as the planning authority will take notice of the Policies which have been written based on the residents feedback.</p>	<p>A lot of hard work has gone into producing this Neighbourhood Plan and I thank the Parish Council for doing this.</p>	<p>Once adopted, Ardleigh Parish Council expects the District Council to give the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan their full statutory weight when making decisions in the area. The Parish Council will continue to comment on applications in their area and anticipate that the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will better support them to resist inappropriate development.</p>
Respondent 30	Yes	<p>The Policies cover a lot of important topics relating to the Parish of Ardleigh and adequately reflect the results of the public surveys</p>	<p>It is essential that we have a Neighbourhood Plan to stop unwanted development in our rural parish.</p>	<p>N/A</p>



Respondent 31	Yes	They seem to be a fair reflection of the issues that matter to most residents and are invaluable to maintain and protect the character of the village of Ardleigh, as well as the environment and natural habitats for nature in this ancient part of the county. Green spaces and an appreciation of what has emerged over millennia, including landscapes, buildings and community need to be protected, especially now.	I welcome the thought of such an item being adopted to ensure the village isn't swallowed up or buried under huge and ad hoc developments of any nature. It's not NIMBY as developments must be part of the future but they must be considered properly and with respect to residents, environment, infrastructure and plain Common Sense! That is how I see the neighbourhood plan.	N/A
Respondent 32	Yes	No	Could have been more emphasis on resisting the despoiling of Ardleigh's rural environment, in particular the proposed substation and enormous pylons.	The Plan does include ambitious policies for the protection of Ardleigh's rural environment. For example, policy EP resists any development that would have an urbanising effect on a rural lane or street and any development that would cause urban intrusion (including by way of noise, light pollution or increased traffic) into currently tranquil rural areas. The Plan also adopts the Village Design Statement (VDS) into policy. The VDS is a pre-existing document that was recently updated to address development undertaken in the parish in the c. 10 years since its initial publication. The VDS clearly identifies the character (built and landscape) of different parts of the parish - for example, is it rural and tranquil? All new development in the area will now be expected - in accordance with policy EP - to pay due regard to the VDS. This will require respect to be shown for the environment's established qualities and features.
Respondent 33	Yes	No	Ardleigh does not need National Grid's proposed substation and pylons, or the proposed connecting wind farm substations.	This comment appears to be in relation to an ongoing major planning application for pylons works in the area which has generated a large local response. This is separate to the Neighbourhood Plan and the Parish Council has engaged with the community on this matter independently of the Plan.

---

Blank.