**Tendring District Local Plan – Issues and Options Consultation Document – September 2015.**

Comments from Cllr John Ashley Mooney (UKIP) – St Paul’s Ward, Clacton:

1. Summary:

This Issues and Options document seems to cover the essential elements, though [clearly] it is short on detail at this point. My significant objections to this document are:

* 705 dpa is too high.
* Priority for the regeneration of Jaywick is absent.
* Lack of support for jobs growth in light industrial sector and [especially] the leisure sector benefitting from our magnificent new beach.
* Insufficient priority to A133 Weeley to Frating upgrade.
* 1000 houses from Colchester/Tendring border is too low.
* Development of land between Thorpe-le-Soken village and station should be specifically identified.
1. Dwellings per annum (dpa):

An updated Objectively Assessed Housing Needs Study has been provided by Peter Brett Associates (PBA), which reduced the original figure of 705dpa to 597dpa (12,000 -> 10,000 homes over the 17 year span of the anticipated plan). However, even this lower number is simply wrong, as the Local Plan Committee agreed when it passed a resolution requiring the TD planning officers to go back and challenge it.

Tendring has been building around 360 dpa over the last decade and the PBA study found no evidence of a restriction in the housing supply. PBA appear to justify the figure of 597dpa on a treatment of an Unexplained Population Change figure which ends up giving Tendring a large inward migration figure (mostly from Outer London) which overwhelms the negative natural change figure. Tendring is the only one of the four districts covered by the PBA study to show this effect. The PBA report almost begs Tendring to challenge its findings, with comments such as these (references are those in the PBA report):

 4.26 Tendring has a large Unattributable Population Change (UPC) adjustment. Here UPC was over 9,000 people negative over the 10 year (Census to Census) period. The Census reported many fewer people in the district than were expected. The impact on the projected housing need is around 200 new homes per year.

4.39 Unlike the other four districts, for Tendring there is a legitimate reason to query the SNPP 2012.

4.42 The only doubtful element in the projections relates to the Unattributable Population Change (UPC) in Tendring.

9.5 If we use an alternative projection that adjusts for the UPC, the demographically projected need for Tending falls from 705 to 479 dpa.

The PBA report, in section 4.37, gives alternative scenarios with wildly differing numbers. The figure for Tendring ranges from 785dpa down to -230dpa. The current figure of 597dpa is simply too high and a figure of around 400dpa would be more appropriate.

1. Jaywick regeneration

In Jaywick, Tendring has some of the cheapest housing in the UK. It has been consistently neglected for decades. I believe this has been, at least in part, due to a decision that development was inappropriate in a location below sea level. Two thoughts: 1 – Jaywick was not overwhelmed by the freakishly high tidal surge last year, and 2 – tell that to the Dutch. The sea defences are adequate and Jaywick should be a priority in this plan.

One key element is access. St John’s Road is not adequate to support regeneration in the area of West Clacton. It is absolutely essential that a link road is built, connecting the A133 to the top of Jaywick Lane. In this regard the Hartley Gardens development in the Issues and Options document is clearly the right choice. However, the pattern of land ownership in this area makes it very unlikely that a single development will deliver this link in one go. So it is essential that smaller developments in this area are only approved where they are consistent with an objective of delivering this link road.

Agreeing a lower DPA figure may appear to remove the need for any of the options set out in section 8 of the Issues and Options document. However, the plan as currently set out leaves very little “headroom” meaning that failure of a relatively small number of projects would prevent the plan being delivered. So, it is my view that the entire set of options in section 8 should remain, with an adapted version of the Hartley Gardens option. A helpful by product of this would be an increased likelihood of the plan passing the inspection that is necessary prior to formal adoption.

1. Jobs growth in the industrial and leisure sectors:

The Issue and Options document only identifies “offshore renewable energy and care and assisted living” as target growth sectors.

I run a business specialising in the low volume, low temperature, sterilisation of medical devices. Around 15% of our turnover is in the UK. We have been growing and recently looked for new premises to move to from our current site on Gorse Lane Ind Est in Clacton. It turns out that since 2007 the only commercial developments in Tendring, other than barn conversion type properties, have been Lanswood, next to Beth Chatto, and Oakwood on Gorse Lane. We have managed to secure one of the units on Oakwood Business Park.

Incidentally, why has TDC not been able to bring the Telford Road business park development, on Gorse Lane Ind Est to fruition? And why is there no plan to have a train station at Gorse Lane Ind Est? Does TDC see light industrial business as a problem rather than a prize?

In searching for new premises I was very struck by the large increase in cost that would accompany any move towards Colchester or beyond. Clacton is an excellent place for us to be based as a business and this plan says nothing about the provision of light industrial premises in Tendring. It should.

Also our magnificent new beach in Clacton and Holland opens up a significant opportunity to develop the leisure industry in Tendring. Why is this not mentioned? One immediate issue that Tendring needs to address is the lack of parking – it was impossible to get parked near this section of seafront on a sunny, but not exactly hot September day, when the last six bays were still closed off. Just how bad is it going to get next summer?

It is not just casual visitors that we should be seeking to attract. This is now an international quality water sports location. It has launching for all types of craft (I am a windsurfer) at all stages of the tide and the current on the outgoing tide is far less than other places with thriving watersports activity, such as West Mersea.

1. A133 Weeley to Frating upgrade:

This is indeed mentioned in section 5.7 and I understand that this is not directly a responsibility of Tendring District Council. Essex County Council? However it is pretty much a pre-requisite for any development in the south of Tendring. The plan needs to say this

1. NW Tendring development:

The border between Colchester and Tendring is clearly a good spot for development, not least because so many people commute from Tendring into Colchester. So it is absolutely right that Tendring has been cooperating with Colchester on development in this area. I believe the number of houses involved is around 7,000. So the question has to be why are Colchester and Tendring only sharing a paltry 2,000 home s in their plans? The Tendring plan runs up to 2032, for heavens sake!

And, Yes – this will involve improving the access to Colchester on the A133 via Clingoe Hill.

1. Thorpe-le-Soken:

This Issue and Options document [clearly] does not set out to specify all development locations. However, in section 8.4 it does list the number of houses going to the conurbations of; Clacton, Harwich, Frinton and Walton, Manningtree, Colchester boundary and Brightlingsea. It leaves 1,000 houses to spread across Tendring’s rural villages. Thorpe-le-Soken should be added specifically to this list.

The area between, the village and Thorpe station is ideally located for development. If 300 houses in Brightlingsea with its awful access merits a mention, the omission of Thorpe-le-Spoken looks like a straightforward mistake. Presumably this would come out of the 1,000 homes in Rural Villages figure, where sustainability is always going to be a difficult issue.