

## Tiptree Site Selection Process

This document outlines the processes that led to the final selection of development sites to be put forward in the Neighbourhood Plan.

### **Three processes were taking place in 2017:**

1. SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment)
2. Questionnaire Analysis
3. Routes Analysis

#### 1. SHLAA

- CBC call for sites in 2014
- TPC call for sites in 2017
- Resulted in some 71 sites being put forward for consideration (see [1 Land Availability Sites](#)).
- SHLAA stage 1 ruled out 24 sites as too remote, too small, poor access, no paperwork, a duplicate site or within the current settlement boundary.
- 47 sites put forward for stage 2 – each site given a RAG rating for each of 50 criteria. The results were peer reviewed and cross checked by CBC (see [File 2 SHLAA –final assessments](#)).
- Summary spreadsheet produced (see [3 SHLAA Comparison](#)).

#### 2. Questionnaire Analysis

- Analysis of ‘closed’ and ‘open’ questions. There was a marginal preference for development to take place in the north-west (Locations F & A)
- Derivation (by the Working Group) of Tiptree Vision and Objectives – an important consideration (and a common theme at Consultation) was not to exacerbate traffic in the main street (Church Road). It is the commercial centre of the village but also a through route eastwards, notably towards Mersea and Tollesbury. It is already busy and hard to bypass. Therefore further traffic created by new development should be avoided. A secondary aim was to avoid increasing traffic on Maldon Road. Therefore one objective is to favour new developments to the north and west of the village on sites that allow access to main routes with minimal impact on the village centre. This broadly concurs with Colchester Local Plan (but see note on the SS14 map below). There was also a strongly expressed desire to protect our wildlife areas and to provide accessible green space or a ‘country park’

- The Community Questionnaire responses indicated a strong desire for our wildlife areas and natural countryside to be protected from development.
  - Of 1055 people responding to the statement ‘We need to protect the ‘rural feel’ and avoid an urban landscape’ 90% were in agreement.
  - Of 1058 who responded to the statement ‘the green spaces around the village should be protected’, 96% agreed.
  - 66% (680 out of 1038 who responded to the question) do not believe Tiptree has sufficient open countryside with public access to meet future needs for recreation.
  - 64% (663 out of 1034) believe that space to roam in beautiful surroundings is a high priority for Tiptree
  - 72% (768 out of 1066) would prioritise the protection of valuable wildlife areas over their development for roads and housing.
- 65% (688 out of 1060) would like to see a country park established in the Tiptree area – of the 567 suggestions as to where that CP should be, 37% (191 comments) suggest the pits/Brook meadows (site TIP 03) area. This was significantly the most popular area.

for Tiptree (see text box below) and also a desire to protect the village heritage – notably the Jam Factory and the Jam factory fields to the south of the village (south of Station Road). This area was the least popular for siting future development.

### 3. Routes Analysis

- Potential routes for a number of new roads around Tiptree were explored (see [4 Tiptree Potential roads](#) and [4a Tiptree Relief Road Options](#)).
- A SWOT analysis was performed on each (see [5 SWOTRoutesV2](#)).
- A Routes Report was written, the latest version included the decision of the March meeting, see below. (see [6 180314 RoutesReportV4](#)).

At a meeting of the NP steering group together with the 'Routes Group' and the 'SHLAA Group' in March 2018 the NP objective to build in the north & west was considered together with the availability of suitable sites and the possibility of improving traffic flow around the village. As a consequence the embryonic NP 'emerged'.

### Further Analysis

- The SHLAA group undertook a further assessment at a deeper level to strengthen the evidence base, this time looking at blocks of sites particularly in the north & west. (see [File 7 Block Assessments](#) and [8 180606TIPTREE SHLAA Sites \(further analysis\)](#)).
- This map illustrates the approximate numbers the various blocks of sites could deliver towards the agreed total of 600 (see [9 Site clusters in N&W](#)).
- The Steering Group considered the various options selecting blocks of sites to achieve 600 houses in the north & west (see [10 180627 Tiptree NHP preferred options](#)). This examined blocks of sites in the north & west and considered the RAG scores, assessed sites according to their ability to fulfil the NP objectives and looked at the potential planning gains they offered. The result was the options were listed in an order of priority.
- When our consultant started work he began by creating a [Leisure & Play Facilities Audit](#) (see [10a](#)) and then considered what the preferred sites could deliver (see [8 180606TIPTREE SHLAA Sites \(further analysis\) Sheet 2](#)). This was a precursor to beginning to formulate NP policies.

In October 2018 the NP Steering Group met with ECC Highways representatives to outline the developing plans for development and link roads. Highways indicated that there were no 'show stoppers' (see [11 181030 Highways meeting](#)). We were therefore surprised at their submission at Regulation 14 (see extract: [12 190718 ECC Objective 14](#)). After a meeting with ECC Highways, CBC planning and the NP Steering Group on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2019 Highways revised their position (See meeting notes: [13 191107 Highways meeting notes](#) and [14 200131 ECC Highways Response](#)).

In October-November 2018 the NP Steering Group also met with the promoters of the selected sites to outline proposals and obtain their engagement with the plan proposals including comprehensive development. In this respect all relevant land promoters are 'on-board' with the NP.

### A note regarding the SS14 eLP policy and map.

The SS14 Policy for Tiptree in the eLP was written at a very early stage of the Neighbourhood Planning process. It took no account of subsequent community consultation and was drafted after

the CBC call for Sites but before the TPC call for sites which added many other options into the mix. Consequently although the broad areas of growth on the **SS14 map** proved to be correct; the final areas of growth that emerged through the NP process were in line with the northern-most arrow on the SS14 map rather than the lower two arrows. This was because:

- The sites in the north gave the best planning gains in terms of access to the A12 north & south and did not exacerbate the traffic on the main roads through the village.
- The central arrow crosses a Local Wildlife Site (N.B. the boundary of the LoWS on the SS14 map is incorrect – the boundary extends further west to include Brook Meadow which is located under the arrow itself – see Colchester Local Wildlife Sites 2015 Part 1, CO10). We would not choose to develop a LoWS when there are other alternatives – it would be contrary to the Colchester eLP and contrary to the wishes of Tiptree residents expressed through community consultation.
- The lower arrow crosses 'Peakes' (Call for sites TIP 65) and ends up on the LoWS (again the boundary of the LoWS is incorrect and the site includes the area under the arrow head. N.B. The Tiptree NP shows the correct boundary as per the Colchester LoWS 2015 document). 'Peakes' ended up as our first 'reserve' option. It has potential but the community gains are less than the northern options and it has the disadvantage of pouring traffic onto the Maldon Road opposite the Heath School.