**Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Development Plan Document (DPD)**

**Tim Batts-Neale representation**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

I write as a local relatively newly-arrived resident – as such I don’t have full sight or knowledge of the entire background and evidence base documents, but wish to make the following comments from my reading of the Transport Evidence reports – mainly in terms of what the evidence shows for clarification of modelling and assumptions, its identification of interventions and informing monitoring, all of which lead to my comments.

These comments largely on movement and connections – hence representation uploaded in this section 8. I also make separate short comments on Chapters 7 and 10.

The table below sets out comments against page numbers and references, with potential alternative wording suggestions to clarify or strengthen the proposed text – generally with underlined text for additional text. I’d be pleased to help clarify any text suggestions.

General comments

* Take the opportunity to strengthen policy and supporting documents – where there’s potential to remove text saying “where appropriate” or “where necessary and appropriate”
* The transport evidence base documents would benefit from text or pointers to other documents to show expected RTS journey times to other destinations, given the importance afforded to this infrastructure. How long does modelling show RTS from TCBGC to eg University of Essex, Hythe station, City Centre, Colchester station, General Hospital, Severalls Business Park?

**Transport Evidence**

**Part 1 Mode Share Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ref | Page  | Para | Report text | Comment |
| 1 | Exec Sum | 2 | “…trends for future travel behaviour and expected travel patterns to and from the garden community” | “…trends for future travel behaviour and expected travel patterns within to and from the garden community…” |
| 2 | 9 | 2 | “moderate gradients” | Text or evidence base ought to set out gradients and especially its effect on potential cyclable trips and pedestrians with restricted mobility or pushing prams etc |
| 3 | 9 | 3 | Significant improvements to network | Improvements and connections also across Salary Brook towards Greenstead – ie a route to avoid A133 corridor and Greenstead roundabout |
| 4 | 15 | 1 | “There are no targets for trips over 5 miles in length.” | Clarify why – unlikely for walk and cycle trips, but long distance trips could be combination of bus / train or car / other vehicle, and the role of RTS to support public transport connections, and reduce use (and ownership) of cars will be a major factor in meeting mode share target and national and local policy |
| 5 | 21 | 1 | “Ebbsfleet may lean on this infrastructure to help them achieve these ambitious mode share targets.” | Note – Ebbsfleet and Gravesend area has a substantial new “Fastrack” service connecting to major destinations – so reliance on proposed RTS for journey times and access from site across local area |
| 6 | 34 |  | “Residual trips achieve the lowest sustainable travel percentages across all years. This is influenced by a number of factors, including service provision beyond five miles of the TCBGC site boundary and the attractiveness of cycling and walking for longer distances.” | As with ref 4, why not introduce targets for trips over 5 miles in length, for bus and / or train?Longer term potential for access to Great Eastern Main Line corridor to NW of site. |
| 7 | 38 | 7 | “Monitoring activities to take place no less than every five years for 30 years and every ten years thereafter” | Other comments below. Initial monitoring at years to be agreed, suggest 1, 3 and 5 years after first occupation, then no less than every five years thereafter. To capture immediate trips and potential to influence travel behaviour and to inform future applications and car / cycle parking requirements. |
|  |  |  | Appendix C:  |  |
| 8 | 2 | 1.1 | “travel to work” | Clarify for wording and monitoring to avoid ambiguity– potential for work to more than one job in different locations (ie 2 part-time jobs) or more than one location for one job (ie a mix of office / site / remote working) |
| 9 | 4 | 1.12 | “It is intrinsically difficult to capture trips entering an area from external origins…” | Potential to make use of locations just outside TCBGC eg University of Essex monitoring as major adjacent employer / trip generator to show trends in changes afforded by eg link road, RTS introduction, other measures, |
| 10 | 11 | 4 | “Required frequency and timing of Travel Plan surveys – likely to comprise a baseline survey after initial occupation, and then surveys at key milestones as the site is built out.” | Comment 7 above - 1, 3 and 5 years after first occupation, then no less than every five years thereafter |
| 11 | 12 |  | “We recommend that initially a frequency no less than once every five years is undertaken for the monitoring ‘events’.” | Comment 7 and 10 above - 1, 3 and 5 years after first occupation, then no less than every five years thereafter |
| 12 | 16 | 5 | “a survey and methodology which results in the least effort from individual households” | Include reference or requirement in wider DPD stewardship section for community engagement and site-wide initiatives and exercises as part of community hubs to capture input. |
| 13 | 17 | 4 | “consideration should be given to additional penalties enshrined in Section 106 agreements or planning conditions” | Additional bullet: “Monitoring and reporting to inform future planning applications and reserved matter applications” – ie to demonstrate initial measures and need for more stronger initiatives to meet mode share targets and mitigate development impacts. |

**Transport Evidence**

**Part 2 Transport Measures**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ref | Page  | Para | Report text | Comment |
| 14 | Exec Sum | 2 | “…trends for future travel behaviour and expected travel patterns to and from the garden community” | “…trends for future travel behaviour and expected travel patterns within to and from the garden community…” |
| 15 | 2 | 3 | “between the east of the city and the city centre” | “between the east of the city and the city centre and other neighbourhoods” – ie connections to Greenstead, Wivenhoe etc |
| 16 | 5 | 4 | “…which is expected to operate satisfactorily up to 2033 for RTS vehicles” | Clarify – but what would impact be on other vehicles? |
| 17 | 5 | 4 | Second and third phases | Note – complexity of making further physical interventions to address congestion and junction capacity after first phases of development – how to construct and manage without major impact on RTS or travel patterns of first phases of development? Potential to bring forward such physical interventions alongside first phase? |
| 18 | 6 | 3&4 | “…aims to create safe, segregated cycle ways from the garden community, though Greenstead roundabout and along St Andrew’s Avenue.” | Comment 2 above – demonstrate more clearly how to overcome the barrier to movement for pedestrians and cyclists of gradients on A133 and how to introduce more level routes to surrounding facilities.  |
| 19 | 16 | 3 | “..where appropriate…” | How much obligation is weakened by reference to “where appropriate”? Who’s decision what is appropriate – developer / applicant or local planning authority? |
| 20 | 16 | 3 | “This would offer the potential to alleviate vehicular trips between these two areas by providing a viable alternative for many short trips.” | Broadly – support – though other design factors on how to provide continuous facility for pedestrians / cyclists and especially for education trips between Wivenhoe and TCBGC secondary school |
| 21 | 17 | 1.6 | “Extend the existing cycleway…” | Clarify – do costs include for improvements to junctions and / or routes through adjacent third party land, eg University of Essex boundary, rather than narrow / non-existent pavements adjacent to B1028 between A133 and Boundary Road. |
| 22 | 21 | 1&2 |  | Other long term initiatives for A120 corridor, to take advantage of proximity to railway corridor for a new railway station (eg example of Chelssmford Beaulieu Park to support major neighbourhood) |
| 23 | 30 | 3 | “New developments are often expected…” | Care with wording – could read “New developments ~~are often expected~~ are required to mitigate impacts and meet government and local policy” – ie  |
| 24 | 33 | 1.13 | Travel Planning table | Clarify range of measures – the £12m amount is equivalent to that spent on public transport subsidy – is this realistic / accurate? Need to set out if these TP measures are for eg, monitoring, free car club membership, cycle facilities / repairs. |
| 25 | 36 | 5 | “To represent the partial mitigation scenarios, the amount of car trips in the transport model has been reduced to reflect the mode share targets. In addition, trips starting and ending within Colchester in the transport model have been reduced by 10%. This reflects that non-GC trip makers would benefit from the TCBGC packages of mitigation measures” | Clarify – is a 10% figure robust? Eg Trips Wivenhoe – Colchester city centre may not see many benefits from RTS segregated RTS lane on A133 Clingoe Hill. Does the reporting in all subsequent scenarios for this 10% reduction help contribute significantly to the measures?Is there potential for a sensitivity test without this 10% reduction to demonstrate robust case for comparison of TCBGC impacts? |
| 26 | 38 | 5 | “The reduction in demand effected in the mitigation scenario for 2033 results…” And in other subsequent page reporting and referencing. | As in 25 above – is this the 10% reduction in demand a significant bearing on the reductions of 45 seconds? |
| 27 | 46 | 3 | “together with mode-choice changing interventions such as improved cycle provision through the junction.” | Comments 2 and 18 above – this evidence base and local topography could also point to need for alternative cycle provision avoiding this complex junction altogether.2 |
| 28 | 65 and 66 | 1 | “…would also be refined and tested in no more detail than possible in this strategic transport evidence study” | Clarify / update – hope that “no” is a typo here! Strategic transport measures will need to be tested in more detail. |
|  |  |  | Appendix B |  |
| 29 | 78 | 8 | “The last 20 years it has increased by 26…” | Clarify – update – missing text! |
| 30 | 79 | B31 |  | Clarify – if references here are National, or any potential to demonstrate for Essex, Colchester / Tendring or other local zones. |

**Submission Version Plan**

**Chapter 7**

**Community and Social Infrastructure**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ref | Page  | Para | Report text | Comment |
| 31 | general | 2 | “The Garden Community will promote wellbeing and a happy, healthy community that is engaged, empowered and socially inclusive.” / Part D Sports, Recreation and Open Space / Part E HealthP 88 “To ensure proposals plan positively and address the determinants of health from the outset, proposals will be required to carry out a Health Impact Assessment (HIA). The purpose of the HIA is to identify opportunities for positive health impacts and potential negative impacts and how they might be mitigated.” | Specific design suggestion to be addressed here or in future design code and outline applications and infrastructure delivery plans. Opportunity to design in from outset and through expansion of neighbourhoods continuous pedestrian / running routes avoiding crossing roads – ability to offer 5km adult / junior “parkrun” events, through any combination of repeated laps. Demand for parkrun increasing and to meet wider Part E Health and wellbeing .To include in text for eg “Continuous pedestrian / running paths avoiding roads” |
| 32 | 84` | F | Stewardship | Comment ref 12 in transport evidence base above – role of strong community and planning obligations to include participation in travel diary and Travel Plan reporting and monitoring. Developer contributions to include a an integral part TP monitoring as part of set up and running costs |

**Chapter 8**

**Movement and Connections**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ref | Page  | Para | Report text | Comment |
| 33 | 92 | 1 | “and shared modes are efficient, safe and cheaper” | “and shared modes are efficient, quicker, safe and cheaper” |
| 34 | 93 | Plan |  | Ref to comments 2, 18, 27 above: Need to show alternative walk / cycle connections to avoid A133 corridor and gradients. Eg 1) a more direct route from Avon Way / Hawthorn Ave junction directly to Knowledge Gateway / University of Essex to meet student / staff trips from residents between Greenstead and University campus |
| 35 | 95 | 2 | “taking into account opportunities for future potential connections” | Welcome this reference – my comment ref 22 above - could be v long term potential for access towards a Great Eastern Main Line new railway station north east of Colchester to better and more directly serve TCBGC and surrounding neighbourhoods. |
| 36 | 96 | 2 | “…will be designed so that pedestrians and cyclists have clear priority at most times.” | “…will be designed so that pedestrians and cyclists have clear priority at most times and disabled persons parking provision.” (There is a reference at p 101 bullet 7 but this would make explicit for disabled persons access) |
| 37 | 96 | 7 | “and secure with most homes within 400m of a traffic-free route.” | Stronger wording for “most homes” – could that be interpreted as 51% of homes? Improve to “all homes” or “x% of homes”? |
| 38 | 97 | 8 | “Direct links to Knowledge Gateway/University of Essex;” | Clarify or more detail in this – would these be by a generous bridge to support pedestrian / cycle connectivity? Would provide substantial benefits above that of surface level crossings for safety and minimising impact on traffic flows. |
| 39 | 98 | 9 | “Ensuring that there is a convenient and high frequency bus service” | Clarify – should “bus service” mean an RTS service, a non-RTS bus service, or both? “Ensuring that there is a convenient and high frequency RTS / bus service” |
| 40 | 98 | 10 | “Where there are on-street bus routes away from the RTS corridor, proposals will need to consider how buses will be given priority” | Strengthen wording: “Where there are on-street bus routes away from the RTS corridor, proposals will need to ~~consider how buses will be~~ give~~n~~ buses priority” |
| 41 | 99 | 4 | “It should be ready for operation during the first phase of the development to influence sustainable travel behaviour” | Strengthen wording – how far can this document set out planning conditions to ensure infrastructure and RTS route is available ahead of occupation? |
| 42 | 102 | 4 | “How provision for cycle parking has taken account of all types of cycles and cycle users.” | “How provision for cycle parking has taken account of all types of cycles and scooters and cycle users.” |
| 43 | 102 | 4 | “How plot and off-plot cycle parking is designed and delivered having regard to LTN1/20…” | “How plot and off-plot cycle parking is designed and delivered ~~having regard~~ to LTN1/20,” How to strengthen wording to exceed / improve on LTN1/20 and ot improve on cycle parking standards. |
| 44 | 104 | 2 | “A bike/e-bike/e-scooter (micro-mobility) hire scheme in the Garden Community.” | “A bike/e-bike/e-scooter (micro-mobility) hire scheme in the Garden Community and adjacent neighbourhoods.” – not much point having hire scheme which can’t connect to other locations beyond site boundaries. |
| 45 | 105 | 3 | “Permission for latter phases of development may not be given if modal split targets for early phases are not being met.” | Strengthen its use and provision ““Permission for latter phases of development will need to demonstrate and be informed by initial phases of Travel Plan monitoring and may not be given if modal split targets for early phases are not being met.” |
| 46 | 106 | 2 | “…will be designed, delivered, funded, and operated within the Garden Community for a period…” | “…will be designed, delivered, funded, and operated within and beyond the Garden Community for a period…” ie to ensure contributions aren’t limited to within the TCBGC borders. |
| 47 | 106 | 5a | “The active travel measures available and how these will be promoted to residents, employees and/or visitors to the Garden Community.” | “The active travel measures available and how these will be funded and promoted to residents, employees and/or visitors to the Garden Community.” |
| 48 | 106 | 5e | “An Action Plan that contains specific actions with timescales.” | “An Action Plan that contains specific actions and funding with timescales.” |
| 49 | 108 | 5 | “A Rapid Transit System (RTS) will be in place to…” | Other potential routes with in-built bus priority – eg to connect into University and boundary road (assuming its own bus gate is retained) to provide alternative ways to avoid A133 and Greenstead roundabout. Other potential routes to surrounding neighbourhoods of Wivenhoe and Elmstead Market to provide local education and shopping and leisure trips. |

**Chapter 10**

**Infrastructure Delivery, Impact Mitigation and Monitoring**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ref | Page  | Para | Report text | Comment |
| 50 | 133 | 7 | Percentage of journeys to work by walking and cycling and percentage of journeys to work by public transport  | Percentage of journeys to work, to education [and other land uses] by walking and cycling and percentage of journeys to work by public transport |
| 51 | 133 | 7 | Levels of modal shift achieved | Clarify if just for on-TCBGC site or off-site |
|  |  |  |  |  |