

# *Great Tey Parish Council*

## GREAT TEY PARISH COUNCIL

### FORMAL OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 260657

Land South of Earls Colne Road, Great Tey

Outline Application for up to 150 Dwellings, Public Open Space, Landscaping, Access, and Associated Works

---

#### INTRODUCTION

Great Tey Parish Council does not oppose appropriate, proportionate, and infrastructure-led growth in principle. However, the Parish Council considers that this proposal represents development of a scale, density, and form fundamentally incompatible with the character, infrastructure capacity, environmental sensitivity, and sustainability constraints of Great Tey.

Great Tey Parish Council OBJECTS in the strongest possible terms to Planning Application 260657 for the proposed development of up to 150 dwellings on land south of Earls Colne Road, Great Tey.

This objection is submitted following detailed consideration of the application documents, the adopted development plan, the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan (the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan was adopted by the City Council in October 2024), the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”), local infrastructure constraints, environmental impacts, and the cumulative consequences of recent and proposed development in and around Great Tey.

This objection has been informed by the views of the many parishioners who attended a specially convened meeting held by Great Tey Parish Council on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2026. Representatives from Mersea Homes were also in attendance.

The Parish Council considers that the proposal represents fundamentally unsustainable development which conflicts with multiple policies within the Colchester Local Plan, the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan, and national planning policy.

The proposal would:

- Urbanise the rural edge of Great Tey.
- Result in a heavily car-dependent form of development.
- Place unacceptable pressure on already constrained infrastructure and services.
- Cause harm to heritage assets and the historic landscape.
- Result in ecological and environmental harm.
- Deliver an excessive and inappropriate housing density for a rural village location.
- Fail to demonstrate adequate infrastructure delivery.
- Fail to provide sufficient certainty regarding transport mitigation, education capacity, sewage treatment, water supply, and healthcare provision.
- Harm residential amenity.
- And undermine the plan-led approach to sustainable development.

The Parish Council further considers that the applicant’s own supporting documentation demonstrates the unsuitability of the site and confirms the presence of multiple overlapping constraints which materially weigh against the proposal.

The proposal appears housing-yield-led rather than landscape-led, with the scale and density of development driven primarily by maximising housing numbers rather than responding appropriately to the site’s historic, environmental and infrastructure constraints.

# *Great Tey Parish Council*

The Parish Council considers that, given the scale and sensitivity of the development, the City Council should require the submission of an indicative masterplan.

Please note that this scheme scores between 24 and 26 on the Department for Transport connectivity tool, which is in stark contrast to the score of approximately eighty-five achieved in central Colchester. This significant disparity demonstrates that Great Tey is heavily car-dependent, with limited access to essential services, employment, and retail facilities by sustainable modes of transport.

For all the reasons set out below, Great Tey Parish Council respectfully but firmly requests that planning permission is REFUSED.

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

### **Planning Application 260657**

#### **1. Unsustainable Location and Car Dependency**

The proposal is not sustainably located and would create a heavily car-dependent form of development contrary to the Colchester Local Plan, Regulation 18 Policy PP36, the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan, and the NPPF.

The proposal represents a significant form of rural expansion in a location with limited accessibility and weak integration with higher order services. It would therefore fail to support a genuinely sustainable pattern of development in accordance with strategic planning objectives.

Public transport provision is extremely poor, with only limited and infrequent bus services available. Railway stations are not realistically accessible by safe walking or cycling routes. The surrounding rural road network lacks continuous footways and safe cycling infrastructure.

The proposal therefore conflicts with:

- Policy SP1 – Sustainable Development;
  - Policy SP7 – Place Shaping Principles;
  - Policy DM20 – Sustainable Transport;
  - Regulation 18 Policy PP36 – sustainable, infrastructure-led growth and settlement strategy;
  - NPPF paragraphs 104, 110–117.
- 

#### **2. Inadequate Infrastructure and Services**

The application fails to demonstrate that infrastructure and services will be delivered before or alongside housing, contrary to infrastructure-first planning principles set out in the development plan and Regulation 18 Policy PP36.

There is insufficient evidence regarding:

- Education capacity;
  - GP provision;
  - NHS dental provision;
  - Sewage treatment capacity;
  - Water supply;
  - Road improvements;
  - Public transport enhancements;
-

## *Great Tey Parish Council*

- Community facilities;
- Long-term infrastructure funding.

Great Tey Primary School is already operating at, or close to, capacity, and no robust mitigation strategy has been identified. Whilst the Local Education Authority may consider that capacity can be accommodated across a number of local schools, residents would reasonably expect children living within the village to be able to attend the village primary school.

The application therefore conflicts with:

- Policy SP1 – Sustainable Development;
- Policy DM12 – Education Provision;
- Regulation 18 Policy PP36 – infrastructure-led growth;
- Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan infrastructure-led growth objectives;
- NPPF paragraphs 95, 100–103.

---

### **3. Water Supply and Sewage Treatment Concerns**

The application does not provide sufficient evidence that the local water supply network or sewage treatment infrastructure in Great Tey can accommodate the scale of development proposed. Residents already experience periods of low water pressure, indicating existing constraints within the local network.

Insufficient evidence has been provided to confirm that the development can be served without placing additional strain on water supply, sewerage, and sewage treatment infrastructure, or without causing adverse impacts to existing residents or the environment. The application also fails to adequately address the cumulative impact of other committed development within the wider area or identify any confirmed infrastructure upgrades and delivery timescales agreed with the relevant utility providers.

It is noted that a Water and Wastewater Study forms part of the emerging Local Plan evidence base; however, this carries limited weight in the absence of adoption and does not substitute for site-specific capacity assessment.

As such, the proposal fails to demonstrate that adequate infrastructure capacity exists to support the development in a sustainable manner. In the absence of clear evidence, secured mitigation, or a deliverable phasing strategy linked to infrastructure provision, there is no certainty that foul drainage impacts can be adequately mitigated in step with the development.

The Parish Council has serious concerns regarding:

- Existing pressure on local sewerage systems;
- Potential flooding and drainage issues;
- Wastewater treatment capacity;
- Long-term water resource sustainability.

No convincing evidence has been provided demonstrating that local sewage works can cope with the additional demand generated by up to 150 dwellings.

The proposal therefore fails to demonstrate compliance with:

- Policy SP1 – Sustainable Development;
- Policy DM18/DM19 – Infrastructure Delivery;
- Regulation 18 Policy PP36 – infrastructure-first approach;
- NPPF paragraphs 180–188.

## 4. Harm to Heritage Assets and Historic Landscape

The site forms part of a historically sensitive medieval fieldscape with significant archaeological potential. The proposal would result in material harm to the setting of the Grade II listed Tey Barn, the dispersed historic settlement pattern, the rural character of Great Tey, and the wider historic landscape setting.

Development must ensure that it does not adversely affect the historic or natural landscape setting of Great Tey. In particular, the view from Earls Colne Road looking south towards Harold Fairs Recreation Ground and St Barnabas Church is identified within the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan as a valued local view which contributes significantly to the rural character, setting, and visual identity of the village. Development which intrudes upon, interrupts, or urbanises this view would materially erode the open and distinctive character of the settlement edge.

The proposal should therefore be considered against Policy GtTey 1: Design (Sections 4.1, 4.3 and 4.9), Policy GtTey 3: Views (Section 4.12), Regulation 18 Policy PP36, and the Essex Design Guide and Essex Green Infrastructure Standards (2022).

The proposal conflicts with:

- Policy DM15 / DM16 – Historic Environment;
- Policy SP7 – Place Shaping;
- Regulation 18 Policy PP36;
- NPPF paragraphs 189–208;
- Policy GT Tey 3 – Views.

---

## 5. Ecological and Environmental Harm

The proposal would result in habitat loss, biodiversity impacts, and erosion of greenfield land.

Concerns include:

- Potential impacts on badgers;
- Great Crested Newts;
- Bat activity;
- Hedgerow loss;
- Habitat fragmentation;
- Inadequate Biodiversity Net Gain evidence.

The Parish Council has limited confidence in ecological mitigation due to previous actions involving hedgerow removal and site alteration.

The proposal conflicts with:

- Policy DM25 – Conservation and Enhancement of the Natural Environment;
- Policy ENV1 – Environment;
- Biodiversity Net Gain Regulations;
- Regulation 18 Policy PP36 – environmental protection principles.

---

## 6. Overdevelopment and Density

The proposal equates to approximately 10–11 dwellings per acre. Whilst this is below the indicative density of fourteen dwellings per acre commonly associated with the wider garden community proposals, a lower numerical density should not in itself be taken as evidence that the proposal would integrate appropriately within the surrounding rural environment or avoid harmful urbanising effects.

It should also be recognised that a significant proportion of the site would need to accommodate essential infrastructure, including SuDS, landscaping, open space, access arrangements, and other mitigation measures. As a result, the developable area available for residential use may be materially reduced, placing further pressure on density, layout, and overall site capacity.

Careful consideration should therefore be given to whether the proposed quantum of development can be accommodated without compromising design quality, landscape character, infrastructure provision, or the wider rural setting of the area. There is also concern that, once land required for infrastructure and mitigation is accounted for, pressure may arise at later stages of the planning process to increase the effective density of the scheme, potentially resulting in a more suburban and urbanising form of development that would be out of keeping with the established rural character of Great Tey.

The proposal conflicts with:

- Policy SP7 – Place Shaping;
- Policy DM10 – Housing Quality and Amenity Standards;
- Regulation 18 Policy PP36.

---

## 7. Failure to Achieve Sustainable Development

The proposal fails across all three dimensions of sustainable development:

### Environmental

- Loss of habitat;
- Landscape harm;
- Increased emissions;
- Greenfield land loss.

### Social

- Pressure on schools and healthcare;
- Lack of sustainable transport;
- Insufficient community infrastructure.

### Economic

- Reliance on private vehicles;
- Unsustainable commuting patterns;
- Inadequate infrastructure planning.

The proposal therefore conflicts with:

- Policy SP1 – Sustainable Development;
- Regulation 18 Policy PP36;
- The presumption in favour of sustainable development within the NPPF.

---

## 8. Planning Balance and Decision-Making Certainty

The application does not provide Members with sufficient certainty or detail to enable a properly informed planning decision in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

The cumulative impact of the proposed development, in combination with existing and committed growth, has not been adequately assessed or mitigated. Even where housing need is afforded weight, this does not override fundamental conflicts with the development plan relating to infrastructure capacity, landscape harm, transport sustainability, and settlement character.

Accordingly, there is insufficient information before the Planning Authority to conclude that the proposal represents sustainable development or that it can be delivered without unacceptable harm.

---

## DETAILED GROUNDS OF OBJECTION

### 1. CONFLICT WITH THE PLAN-LED STRATEGY

The application site lies outside the adopted settlement boundary and is not allocated for development within the adopted Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan.

The Neighbourhood Plan forms part of the statutory development plan and carries full weight in planning decision-making.

The proposal therefore conflicts with the established spatial strategy for Great Tey.

The applicant relies heavily upon the emerging Local Plan allocation PP36. However:

- Emerging policies carry limited weight prior to examination and adoption.
- The emerging allocation refers to approximately 125 dwellings rather than 150 dwellings.
- The current proposal materially exceeds the indicative development scale.
- The proposal therefore represents intensified and premature development.

Notwithstanding this, the adopted Section 2 Local Plan remains part of the statutory development plan and continues to carry full weight in decision-making. Furthermore, although elements of the Section 1 Local Plan may now be more than five years old, they nevertheless continue to attract material weight, particularly where policies remain broadly consistent with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and the plan-led approach to sustainable development.

Accordingly, any shortfall in housing land supply should not automatically override other material planning considerations, including landscape impact, infrastructure constraints, settlement character, and compliance with adopted local planning policies.

Accordingly:

- The tilted balance under NPPF paragraph 11(d) is not engaged.
- There is no overriding housing need requiring release of unallocated countryside land.
- The proposal is not justified by any exceptional circumstance.

The Parish Council therefore considers that the principle of development is unacceptable.

---

### 2. INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES

Without prejudice to the objections raised above, it is considered that any development of this scale would require substantial and clearly secured Section 106 contributions and infrastructure commitments in order to mitigate its impacts. This would include, but not be limited to, the provision of safe and accessible pedestrian and cycle routes connecting to key local facilities and services, significant improvements to public transport provision and bus service frequency, the resolution of existing and future school capacity constraints, and confirmed upgrades to water supply, foul drainage, and wastewater treatment infrastructure.

## *Great Tey Parish Council*

Given the existing infrastructure constraints within and around Great Tey, there remains considerable uncertainty as to whether the necessary mitigation and infrastructure improvements could be delivered in a timely and coordinated manner, or whether sufficient funding mechanisms are available to secure them in full. In the absence of detailed and deliverable mitigation proposals, there is a significant risk that the impacts of the development would fall disproportionately upon existing residents and local services.

Consideration should also be given to the cumulative impact of additional traffic generation, increased pressure on healthcare and community facilities, recreational space requirements, long-term maintenance obligations for SuDS and green infrastructure, and the overall deliverability and viability of the development should extensive infrastructure mitigation be required.

Accordingly, the application presently fails to provide sufficient certainty that the necessary infrastructure, mitigation measures, and community benefits could be secured to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

### **Failure to Demonstrate Infrastructure Delivery**

The proposed development represents a significant scale of growth, equating to an approximate 50% increase in the size of Great Tey. This constitutes a step change in the size and function of the village, which would require comprehensive master planning to ensure it is properly integrated with the existing settlement, rather than forming an isolated or poorly connected extension.

Whilst it is anticipated that officers may contend that detailed design matters and Section 106 obligations can be addressed at reserved matters stage, this approach would not provide sufficient certainty at the outline stage given the scale and implications of the proposal. In this case, it is considered essential that key structural principles and infrastructure commitments are established upfront to enable the Planning Committee to make an informed and balanced determination.

In particular, there is currently insufficient information before Members regarding: (i) how the development would be physically, functionally, and socially integrated with the existing village, including movement connections, access strategy, and permeability; and (ii) what Section 106 contributions would be secured to adequately mitigate the full range of infrastructure impacts arising from the development.

It is anticipated that the applicant may argue that many infrastructure requirements fall outside the direct scope of Section 106 obligations. However, this does not address the issue of cumulative impact arising from a development of this scale. Evidence, including the AECOM infrastructure audit, identifies the need for significant infrastructure investment over the plan period, estimated at approximately £800m, equating to around £20,000 per dwelling. This highlights the scale of cumulative infrastructure burden that must be meticulously planned for and mitigated.

In the absence of a comprehensive masterplan and a clearly defined and deliverable infrastructure funding strategy, there remains insufficient certainty that the development can be acceptably integrated or that its full impacts can be appropriately mitigated. The absence of an overarching masterplan framework also creates a clear risk of a piecemeal or uncoordinated form of development, which would fail to deliver coherent integration with the existing settlement or ensure carefully planned infrastructure delivery.

As such, the Planning Committee is not currently in possession of the necessary information to make a fully informed planning judgement.

The application fails to demonstrate that essential infrastructure and services will be delivered before or alongside housing occupation.

The proposal provides inadequate certainty regarding:

## *Great Tey Parish Council*

- Roads and junction improvements.
- Public transport enhancements.
- Primary school provision.
- Secondary school capacity.
- GP surgery capacity.
- NHS dental provision.
- Sewage treatment infrastructure.
- Water supply infrastructure.
- Community and youth facilities.
- Shops and local services.

The Parish Council is particularly concerned that the development would significantly increase pressure on already constrained local infrastructure.

### **Education Capacity**

Great Tey Primary School is already at or near capacity.

The application does not demonstrate:

- Availability of sufficient school places.
- Deliverable expansion proposals.
- Funded mitigation.
- Timely infrastructure delivery.

This conflicts with:

- Policy DM12 – Education Provision.
- Policy SP1 – Sustainable Development.

### **Healthcare Infrastructure**

No robust evidence has been provided demonstrating:

- Sufficient GP capacity.
- NHS dental provision.
- Healthcare infrastructure funding.
- Deliverable NHS expansion arrangements.
- Accessibility to local healthcare services.

Existing healthcare services are already under pressure.

The proposal therefore risks placing unsustainable additional strain on local healthcare provision.

### **Shops and Community Facilities**

The scale of development proposed is not supported by equivalent investment in local services and facilities.

The proposal therefore risks creating a dormitory-style estate heavily reliant upon travel outside the village for everyday needs.

This is contrary to sustainable development principles.

---

### **3. WATER SUPPLY**

The Parish Council has serious concerns regarding the adequacy and resilience of local water supply infrastructure.

The application fails to provide sufficient evidence demonstrating that:

- Existing water supply infrastructure can accommodate the development.
- Long-term water resource sustainability has been assessed.
- The proposal will not adversely affect existing residents.
- Appropriate upgrades will be delivered prior to occupation.

The scale of development proposed would create substantial additional demand on water infrastructure.

In the absence of robust evidence and guaranteed infrastructure delivery, the application fails to demonstrate sustainable development.

---

### **4. SEWAGE TREATMENT AND DRAINAGE**

The application fails to demonstrate that the local sewage treatment infrastructure has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed development without risk of overload or adverse environmental impact.

It is noted that a Water and Wastewater Study forms part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan. However, limited weight can currently be afforded to emerging evidence where it has not yet been fully examined or adopted, and where site-specific capacity and cumulative impact implications have not been robustly demonstrated within the application itself. Relevant policies within the adopted development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework require development to demonstrate that adequate foul drainage and wastewater capacity is available or can be made available in a timely and deliverable manner, without unacceptable harm.

Officers and the applicant may argue that reliance on emerging Local Plan evidence is sufficient and that no further assessment is required. However, given the scale of development proposed and existing indications of infrastructure constraint, a site-specific and up-to-date capacity assessment is necessary to properly demonstrate deliverability and compliance with planning policy, including the requirement to ensure that infrastructure is in place to serve development without unacceptable risk or delay.

In the absence of confirmed capacity, identified upgrade requirements, or a deliverable phasing strategy linked to infrastructure provision, there is no certainty that foul drainage impacts can be adequately mitigated in step with the development.

The Parish Council has significant concerns regarding:

- Existing sewer network capacity.
- Potential foul drainage failures.
- Wastewater treatment capacity.

## *Great Tey Parish Council*

- Surface water drainage.
- Flood risk implications.
- Long-term maintenance arrangements.

No detailed evidence has been provided confirming:

- That local sewage works can cope with the development.
- That upgrades will be completed before occupation.
- That there will be no adverse environmental impacts.

This is a major omission given the scale of development proposed.

The application therefore fails to demonstrate policy compliance regarding sustainable infrastructure and environmental protection.

---

### **5. AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

The Parish Council notes that the application does not provide sufficient certainty regarding affordable housing delivery.

Any development of this scale should provide:

- At least 30% affordable housing.
- A meaningful proportion of genuine social rent housing.
- Housing accessible to local people.
- Affordable homes aligned with identified local needs.

The Parish Council is concerned that:

- Affordable housing provision may be reduced through viability arguments.
- Housing delivery may prioritise market housing over community need.
- The proposed housing mix may fail to meet local requirements.

The Parish Council expects any development proposal to provide robust and enforceable affordable housing commitments secured through legal agreement.

---

### **6. TRANSPORT AND ACTIVE TRAVEL**

#### **Unsustainable Location**

The site is not sustainably located.

The proposal relies heavily upon private vehicle use contrary to sustainable transport policy.

The surrounding transport network is fundamentally unsuitable for a development of this scale.

#### **Poor Public Transport Provision**

Bus services are extremely limited.

The Framework Travel Plan identifies only:

- Service 82 (twice daily).
- School-only services.

These services do not provide realistic alternatives to private car use.

### **Rail Accessibility**

The proposal relies upon accessibility to:

- Chappel & Wakes Colne Station.
- Marks Tey Station.

However, practical accessibility is severely constrained by:

- Narrow rural roads.
- Lack of footways.
- Unsafe walking conditions.
- Poor cycling infrastructure.
- Reliance upon the A120 and A1124 Corridors.

### **Inadequate Walking and Cycling Infrastructure**

The Transport Assessment itself confirms that:

- There are no continuous footways along significant sections of Earls Colne Road and Chappel Road.
- Existing roads are narrow and rural in character.
- Safe active travel routes are absent.

The proposal therefore fails to provide:

- Safe pedestrian access.
- Safe cycle infrastructure.
- Integrated active travel networks.

### **Inadequate Travel Plan**

The Framework Travel Plan relies excessively upon weak “soft measures,” including:

- Promotional material.
- Incentives.
- Behavioural encouragement.

The targets for modal shift are weak and unrealistic.

The Travel Plan:

- Lacks firm commitments.
- Defers mitigation.
- Fails to demonstrate meaningful reduction in private car use.

This conflicts with:

- Policy DM20 – Sustainable Transport.
- Policy SP7 – Place Shaping.

### **Highway Safety and Traffic Impact**

The proposal would significantly increase traffic on unsuitable rural roads.

Concerns include:

- Highway safety risks.
- Increased congestion.
- School peak-time traffic.
- Cumulative impacts with other developments.
- Pressure on the A120 and A1124 corridors.

The Parish Council strongly supports formal consultation with National Highways regarding cumulative impacts on the A120 and A1124 corridors and wider strategic road network. Especially due to no constraints recognised by National Highways at A12 Junctions 25 and 26.

The Parish Council considers that:

- Strategic corridor modelling should be undertaken.
- Cumulative traffic impacts should be assessed across the wider area.
- The interaction between proposed growth sites and the A120 and A1124 corridors requires comprehensive assessment before any decision is made.

The residual cumulative impacts are likely to approach or exceed the “severe” threshold identified in the NPPF.

The proposal therefore conflicts with:

- Policy DM20 – Sustainable Transport.
- Policy DM1 – Health and Wellbeing.

---

## **7. DENSITY AND OVERDEVELOPMENT**

Whilst the proposed density of approximately 10–11 dwellings per acre may not in itself be regarded as high in numerical terms, this does not address the wider issue of settlement form and character. Of greater relevance is the manner in which the development would be laid out and experienced at the edge of Great Tey. At present, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proposal would achieve a sensitive and appropriate transition between the existing village and the surrounding countryside, or that it would reflect the established grain, morphology, and landscape-led structure of the settlement. In the absence of a clear landscape-led framework and detailed design principles, there remains a significant risk that the development would result in an urbanising and suburbanising edge to the village, rather than a form of development that integrates appropriately with its rural context. This would be contrary to the design and landscape objectives of the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan, the Essex Design Guide, and the National Planning Policy Framework, all of which seek to ensure that development responds positively to local character and avoids harm to the distinct identity and setting of rural settlements. Particular attention should be given to the treatment of the settlement edge, where insufficient landscape structure or meaningful buffering would result in a hard and visually intrusive urban boundary.

## *Great Tey Parish Council*

The proposal represents a clear process of suburbanisation and urbanisation of the village edge through:

- Engineered estate layouts.
- Intensified built form.
- Urban road infrastructure.
- Lighting and hard surfacing.
- Reduced rural transition.

The Parish Council considers that the scheme departs materially from a landscape-led approach to development.

The proposal would:

- Urbanise the countryside edge.
- Introduce compact suburban estate character.
- Harm local distinctiveness.
- Result in cramped layouts.
- Reduce residential amenity.

The development is materially denser than nearby village-edge schemes and fails to reflect the dispersed historic settlement pattern characteristic of Great Tey.

The Parish Council considers that the applicant has intentionally pursued a high-density scheme in order to maximise development value.

The proposal is therefore contrary to:

- Policy SP7 – Place Shaping Principles.
- Policy DM10 – Housing Quality and Amenity Standards.
- Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan design principles.

---

### **8. GREEN SPACE**

The Parish Council is concerned that the proposed development fails to provide sufficient meaningful green infrastructure and open space.

The application does not clearly demonstrate:

- At least 40% genuine green space provision.
- Effective green corridors.
- Long-term landscape management.
- Protection of rural character.

The proposed landscaping appears heavily mitigation-led rather than genuinely landscape-led.

Mitigation planting cannot replace:

- Historic landscape character.
- Medieval fieldscape.

- Existing countryside setting.

The Parish Council considers that the western portion of the site should remain open countryside if any development were ever considered.

---

## 9. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

### Loss of Greenfield Land and Rural Character

The proposal would result in the irreversible loss of greenfield countryside.

The site forms part of a historically sensitive rural landscape.

The development would:

- Extend built form into open countryside.
- Erode rural settlement character.
- Urbanise the village edge.
- Harm landscape quality.

### Ecological Harm

The Parish Council has major concerns regarding:

- Habitat loss.
- Badger impacts.
- Great Crested Newts.
- Bat activity.
- Hedgerow loss.
- Biodiversity fragmentation.

The applicant's ecological evidence base is incomplete.

The inability to access adjoining land for survey purposes does not remove legal responsibilities regarding protected species assessment.

### Biodiversity Net Gain

The application fails to provide:

- Transparent statutory biodiversity metrics.
- A credible 30-year management mechanism.
- Robust Biodiversity Net Gain evidence.

### Agricultural Land

The Parish Council is concerned regarding the unnecessary loss of productive countryside land in circumstances where:

- The Council already maintains a five-year housing land supply.
- The site is unallocated.

## *Great Tey Parish Council*

- There is no overriding housing need.

The proposal therefore conflicts with:

- Policy DM25.
  - Policy ENV1.
  - National biodiversity and environmental policy.
- 

### **10. LOCAL SUPPORT**

The Parish Council notes substantial local concern and objection regarding the proposal.

Residents have raised serious concerns relating to:

- Traffic.
- Infrastructure.
- School capacity.
- Rural character.
- Heritage.
- Ecology.
- Overdevelopment.
- Residential amenity.
- Developer conduct.

The Parish Council also notes concerns regarding the lack of meaningful public engagement undertaken by the applicant prior to submission.

Given:

- The scale of the proposal.
- The approved Neighbourhood Plan.
- Previous local planning controversies.
- And the significant impacts arising,

The lack of meaningful community engagement is particularly disappointing.

---

### **11. LOCAL HOUSING NUMBERS**

The proposal should not be treated as justified simply because it references an emerging Local Plan allocation.

The emerging allocation:

- Carries limited weight.
  - Refers to approximately 125 dwellings.
  - Does not justify a substantially larger scheme.
-

Furthermore:

- The tilted balance is not engaged.
- There is no overriding need for speculative countryside release.

The proposal therefore conflicts with the plan-led system.

---

## **12. HOUSING TYPE AND LOCAL NEED**

The application does not sufficiently demonstrate that the proposed housing mix aligns with identified local housing need.

The Parish Council considers that local housing needs are more likely to include:

- Family homes.
- Bungalows.
- Smaller-scale rural housing.
- Affordable and social rented homes for local people.

The current proposal instead appears to prioritise high-volume market housing delivery.

The Parish Council is concerned that the scheme:

- Does not adequately respond to local demographic need.
  - Risks creating commuter-led suburban expansion.
  - Fails to reflect the character of Great Tey.
- 

## **13. DESIGN AND AESTHETICS**

The proposal fails to demonstrate a design approach genuinely responsive to:

- Local character.
- Rural settlement pattern.
- Historic landscape.
- Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan design objectives.

The proposed estate form development would:

- Urbanise the village edge.
- Harm rural identity.
- Introduce suburban density and layout patterns.
- Diminish local distinctiveness.

The outline nature of the application further defers critical matters relating to:

- Layout.
  - Appearance.
-

## *Great Tey Parish Council*

- Landscape treatment.
- Building relationships.
- Green infrastructure.

The Parish Council considers this lack of detail unacceptable for a proposal of such scale and sensitivity.

The City Council should require the submission of comprehensive masterplan principles as part of the determination of this outline application. Given the scale, complexity, and step-change nature of the development, such principles are fundamental to understanding how the proposal would be structured, integrated, and delivered in a coherent and sustainable manner. It is therefore considered that these matters should have been provided upfront alongside the outline application, and the application should not be recommended for approval in the absence of a clear, tested, and publicly consulted masterplan framework. To do so would pre-empt the proper assessment of key spatial and design considerations which are central to the acceptability of the scheme.

This should include, as a minimum:

- A detailed indicative masterplan.
- Comprehensive design analysis.
- Binding compliance with any approved masterplan through Reserved Matters.

---

### **14. EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES**

The Parish Council does not consider that the proposal would make a meaningful positive contribution to local employment opportunities.

The development is fundamentally residential in nature and would:

- Increase outbound commuting.
- Increase reliance on private vehicles.
- Intensify pressure on transport infrastructure.

The economic benefits associated with construction activity are temporary and do not outweigh the long-term harms identified.

---

### **15. SUSTAINABILITY AND COMMUNITY INTEGRATION**

The proposal fails to demonstrate credible long-term sustainability.

The development would:

- Create car-dependent living patterns.
- Place pressure on infrastructure.
- Urbanise a rural settlement.
- Harm community cohesion.
- Fail to integrate appropriately with the historic village form.

## *Great Tey Parish Council*

The Parish Council strongly supports the principle that infrastructure planning must be strategic and comprehensive rather than piecemeal.

The cumulative impacts of major housing growth across the wider area require coordinated planning regarding:

- Roads.
- Public transport.
- Schools.
- Healthcare.
- Community facilities.
- Youth provision.
- Safe walking and cycling routes.

Public transport improvements should include meaningful Section 106 funding for additional and regular bus services.

The Parish Council further supports the creation of genuinely safe walking and cycling routes between settlements and services as part of any wider strategic infrastructure approach.

---

### **16. HERITAGE, ARCHAEOLOGY AND LANDSCAPE HARM**

The applicant's own Archaeological Desk Based Assessment confirms that:

- Multi-period archaeological deposits are present.
- The fieldscape is ancient and likely medieval in origin.
- The historic settlement pattern is dispersed and highly sensitive.

These findings are highly significant.

The proposal would materially harm:

- The setting of the Grade II listed Tey Barn.
- The wider medieval fieldscape.
- Historic settlement character.
- Rural landscape setting.

The submitted Heritage Impact Assessment fails adequately to assess:

- Key views.
- Experiential qualities.
- Cumulative impacts.
- The true significance of the rural setting.

The Parish Council therefore considers that the proposal conflicts with:

- Policy DM15 / DM16.
- Policy SP7.

- NPPF heritage policy.
- 

#### **17. RESIDENTIAL AMENITY IMPACT**

The proposal would result in unacceptable impacts upon neighbouring residential amenity.

Residents along:

- Chappel Road.
- Lower Langley.
- Adjacent residential boundaries,

Would likely experience:

- Overlooking.
- Loss of privacy.
- Overbearing development.
- Noise disturbance.
- Increased traffic and activity.

The Parish Council also notes concerns regarding construction impacts including:

- Dust nuisance.
- Noise.
- Early start times.
- Reversing alarms.
- Site management.

Previous nearby development experience has raised legitimate concerns regarding:

- Compliance with conditions.
- Deliverability of mitigation.
- Protection of neighbouring amenity.

The proposal therefore conflicts with:

- Policy DM1 – Health and Wellbeing.
  - Policy DM10 – Housing Quality and Amenity.
  - Policy DM23 – Environmental Protection.
- 

#### **18. CONCERNS REGARDING DEVELOPER CONDUCT AND DELIVERY CONFIDENCE**

The Parish Council notes widespread local concern regarding the applicant's actions prior to submission of the planning application.

It is understood that:

---

## *Great Tey Parish Council*

- The developer purchased the land.
- Purchased Marshalls Cottage.
- Reconfigured the garden.
- Removed hedgerows.
- Created access arrangements prior to submitting the application.

These actions have contributed to significant local concern regarding:

- The applicant's proposed development intentions, including the additional access point adjacent to Marshalls Cottage, are considered to raise serious highway safety concerns. The introduction of multiple access points would be inappropriate in this location, and it is considered that any development of the site should be served by a single, safe, and appropriately designed access arrangement to ensure highway safety and minimise conflict with existing movements.
- Confidence in ecological mitigation.
- Confidence in future compliance with planning conditions.
- Confidence in future compliance with planning conditions.
- Confidence in ecological protection and mitigation.

The Parish Council is concerned that the proposal appears to have been designed to maximise housing numbers and development value rather than respond sensitively to the site's constraints.

---

### **19. PROCEDURAL AND TECHNICAL DEFICIENCIES**

The Parish Council considers that the application is fundamentally deficient and lacks sufficient detail to enable proper determination.

Key deficiencies include:

- Absence of an integrated heritage assessment.
- Incomplete archaeological evaluation.
- Inadequate ecological evidence.
- Absence of transparent Biodiversity Net Gain calculations.
- Unrealistic transport assumptions.
- Insufficient cumulative impact assessment.
- Lack of robust infrastructure evidence.
- Inadequate green infrastructure strategy.

The Parish Council strongly agrees that:

- The application is unusually thin for a development of this scale.
- The supporting evidence is inadequate.
- Far more detailed analysis is required before any decision could reasonably be contemplated.

If any development were ever considered, the Council should require:

- A comprehensive indicative masterplan.
  - Detailed infrastructure strategy.
  - Full cumulative transport assessment.
  - National Highways consultation.
  - Robust infrastructure-led phasing.
- 

### **20. PREMATURETY AND EMERGING LOCAL PLAN CONCERNS**

The Parish Council considers that the application is premature and seeks to pre-empt the proper plan-led consideration of growth through the emerging Local Plan process.

The application relies heavily upon emerging allocation PP36 despite:

- The allocation not yet being adopted.
- The emerging policy carrying limited weight.
- The indicative allocation referring to approximately 125 dwellings rather than 150 dwellings.
- Key infrastructure questions remaining unresolved.

The proposal therefore attempts to pre-empt:

- Proper master planning.
- Strategic infrastructure planning.
- Comprehensive transport assessment.
- Cumulative impact assessment.
- Settlement edge design.
- Landscape mitigation.
- Environmental safeguards.

This is particularly concerning given the scale of cumulative growth proposed across the wider area and the absence of coordinated infrastructure planning.

The Parish Council considers that it would be inappropriate to permit speculative edge-of-village expansion ahead of the completion of the proper plan-led process.

---

### **21. CUMULATIVE IMPACT ACROSS THE WIDER AREA**

The application fails adequately to assess the cumulative impacts arising from significant housing growth across Great Tey and the surrounding Seven Parishes area.

The Parish Council strongly objects to the piecemeal approach currently being taken to infrastructure and growth.

The cumulative impacts of proposed development across the wider area include:

- Increased pressure on the A120 and A1124 corridors.
-

## *Great Tey Parish Council*

- Increased traffic congestion.
- Pressure on rural roads.
- Increased school demand.
- Increased healthcare demand.
- Pressure on sewage treatment infrastructure.
- Pressure on water supply.
- Increased carbon emissions.
- Pressure on community facilities.
- Loss of rural character.

The Parish Council considers that infrastructure planning must be strategic and comprehensive rather than fragmented across multiple village sites.

Piecemeal mitigation measures negotiated independently for each development proposal will not adequately address:

- Strategic transport movement.
- Sustainable travel patterns.
- Healthcare provision.
- Education planning.
- Community infrastructure.
- Environmental resilience.

The Parish Council therefore strongly supports:

- Strategic infrastructure-led planning.
- Safe inter-village walking and cycling routes.
- Meaningful Section 106 contributions toward enhanced public transport.
- Revenue funding for improved and regular bus services.
- Strategic transport assessment involving National Highways.

The cumulative impacts of development on the A120 and A1124 roads and surrounding network should be formally assessed in consultation with National Highways.

---

## **22. CLIMATE CHANGE AND CARBON EMISSIONS**

The proposal conflicts with climate resilience and carbon reduction objectives.

The development would:

- Lock future residents into long-term car dependency.
- Generate significant transport-related carbon emissions.

## *Great Tey Parish Council*

- Increase commuting-based travel patterns.
- Result in embodied carbon associated with major greenfield construction.
- Remove existing vegetation and landscape features contributing to carbon sequestration.

The application fails adequately to demonstrate:

- Carbon reduction measures.
- Climate resilience.
- Genuine sustainable transport alternatives.
- Alignment with net-zero objectives.

The Parish Council considers that the proposal represents an outdated pattern of predict-and-provide car-based development inconsistent with modern sustainable planning principles.

This conflicts with:

- National climate objectives.
- Sustainable development principles.
- Local climate policy objectives.

---

### **23. LOSS OF COUNTRYSIDE AND AGRICULTURAL LAND**

The proposal would result in the unnecessary loss of productive countryside land.

The Parish Council considers that increasing importance should be attached to:

- Food security.
- Agricultural resilience.
- Protection of countryside resources.
- Avoidance of unnecessary greenfield loss.

This is particularly relevant given:

- The absence of overriding housing need.
- Existing vacant housing stock within the wider district.
- The site's environmental and infrastructure constraints.

The proposal therefore represents unnecessary encroachment into sensitive rural countryside.

---

### **24. WEIGHT TO THE GREAT TEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

The Parish Council emphasises that the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan (adopted by Colchester City Council in October 2024) forms part of the statutory development plan and should be afforded substantial weight.

The Neighbourhood Plan:

- Was recently adopted.

## *Great Tey Parish Council*

- Was democratically endorsed by the local community.
- Reflects locally agreed planning priorities.
- Promotes infrastructure-led and proportionate growth.
- Seeks to protect rural character and settlement identity.
- Seeks to avoid suburbanisation of the village edge.
- Already has planned housing growth identified up to 2033. Any additional development beyond this period should be considered through the proper plan-making process following that date, rather than being brought forward prematurely outside the established development strategy.

The proposal conflicts fundamentally with those objectives.

The Parish Council considers that granting permission for this proposal would materially undermine confidence in the neighbourhood planning process and the integrity of the plan-led system.

---

### **25. FAILURE OF MEANINGFUL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

The Parish Council is disappointed by the applicant's failure to undertake meaningful community engagement prior to submission of the application.

Given:

- The scale of the proposal.
- The sensitivity of the site.
- The existence of an adopted Neighbourhood Plan.
- Previous local planning concerns regarding nearby developments,

The applicant should have engaged proactively and collaboratively with:

- The Parish Council.
- Local residents.
- Community stakeholders.

Instead, the application has been perceived locally as developer-led and imposed upon the community without meaningful consultation.

The Parish Council considers that the quality of pre-application engagement has fallen materially below what should reasonably be expected for a development of this scale.

---

### **26. OUTLINE APPLICATION RISKS AND RESERVED MATTERS UNCERTAINTY**

The outline nature of the application creates substantial uncertainty regarding the true impacts of the proposal.

Critical matters are deferred, including:

- Detailed layout.
- Density distribution.
- Building relationships.

## *Great Tey Parish Council*

- Landscaping.
- Parking arrangements.
- Open space quality.
- Boundary treatment.
- Heritage mitigation.
- Residential amenity impacts.

The Parish Council considers that the Local Planning Authority cannot properly assess the full impacts of the development in the absence of:

- Detailed parameter plans.
- Robust master planning.
- Secured mitigation.
- Comprehensive design information.

This lack of certainty is particularly unacceptable given the sensitivity of the site and the scale of development proposed.

If the Council were minded considering any form of development, a detailed and binding masterplan should be required with subsequent Reserved Matters applications required to conform strictly to the approved framework.

---

### **27. HERITAGE HARM AND PUBLIC BENEFITS TEST**

The Parish Council considers that the proposal would result in at minimum “less than substantial harm” to designated heritage assets and their settings within the meaning of the NPPF.

This includes harm to:

- The setting of the Grade II listed Tey Barn.
- The historic rural landscape.
- The medieval fieldscape.
- The dispersed settlement pattern characteristic of Great Tey.

Under the NPPF, such harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

The Parish Council considers that the limited public benefits associated with the development do not outweigh the identified heritage harm, particularly where:

- There is no overriding housing need.
- The Council maintains a five-year housing land supply.
- The site is unallocated within the adopted Neighbourhood Plan.
- The proposal exceeds the indicative scale of the emerging allocation.

The proposal therefore conflicts with national and local heritage policy.

---

## **28. CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS AND CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT**

The Parish Council has serious concerns regarding construction-phase impacts.

Previous experience with nearby development sites has demonstrated issues including:

- Early working hours.
- Dust nuisance.
- Noise disturbance.
- Intrusive reversing alarms.
- Poor site management.

The proposed development would likely generate substantial:

- Heavy Goods Vehicle movements.
- Construction traffic.
- Mud on roads.
- Noise and vibration.
- Pedestrian safety risks.
- Conflict with school traffic and village movement patterns.

The surrounding rural road network is poorly suited to accommodating sustained construction traffic associated with a major development of this scale.

These concerns further undermine confidence in:

- Deliverability of mitigation.
- Compliance with planning conditions.
- Protection of residential amenity.

---

## **29. BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN DELIVERY CONCERNS**

The Parish Council remains unconvinced that genuine policy-compliant Biodiversity Net Gain can be achieved.

The application lacks:

- Transparent statutory biodiversity calculations.
- Credible long-term management arrangements.
- Detailed habitat delivery mechanisms.
- Sufficient evidence regarding ecological connectivity.

The Parish Council is concerned that biodiversity mitigation appears secondary to maximising housing yield and development density.

In the absence of robust evidence and enforceable long-term delivery arrangements, the proposal fails adequately to demonstrate compliance with biodiversity policy requirements.

## 30. DRAINAGE, FLOOD RISK AND CLIMATE RESILIENCE

The Parish Council has significant concerns regarding:

- Surface water drainage.
- Long-term SuDS maintenance.
- Downstream flood risk.
- Increased runoff arising from extensive hard surfacing.
- Climate resilience during extreme rainfall events.

The application fails adequately to demonstrate:

- Robust drainage infrastructure.
- Long-term maintenance certainty.
- Protection against future climate-related flood risk.

Given increasing extreme weather events, these matters require substantial weight in decision-making.

---

## 31. NEED FOR INDEPENDENT REVIEW AND FURTHER TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The Parish Council considers that the supporting evidence submitted with the application is inadequate and overly optimistic in several key respects.

The Parish Council therefore requests that the Local Planning Authority require:

- Independent transport review.
- Independent heritage assessment.
- Independent ecological review.
- Comprehensive cumulative infrastructure analysis.
- Strategic transport modelling including National Highways input.

The Parish Council considers that the current submission does not provide a sufficiently robust basis for informed decision-making.

---

## SUGGESTED REASONS FOR REFUSAL

### 1. Unsustainable Location and Car Dependency

The proposal represents unsustainable development contrary to Policies SP1, SP7 and DM20 of the Colchester Local Plan and paragraphs 110–117 of the NPPF by reason of poor accessibility to sustainable transport modes, inadequate public transport provision, lack of safe walking and cycling infrastructure, and resulting reliance upon private vehicle use. Please note that this scheme scores between 24 and 26 on the Department for Transport connectivity tool, which is in stark contrast to the score of approximately eighty-five achieved in central Colchester. This significant disparity demonstrates that Great Tey is heavily car-dependent, with limited access to essential services, employment, and retail facilities by sustainable modes of transport.

### 2. Harm to Rural Character and Landscape

# *Great Tey Parish Council*

The proposal would result in unacceptable urbanisation and suburbanisation of the rural edge of Great Tey, causing harm to landscape character, settlement form and countryside setting contrary to Policies SP7 and ENV1 and the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan.

### **3. Heritage Harm**

The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance and setting of designated heritage assets, including the Grade II listed Tey Barn, contrary to Policies DM15 and DM16 and paragraphs 204–213 of the NPPF. The identified public benefits do not outweigh the heritage harm.

### **4. Inadequate Infrastructure Capacity**

The application fails adequately to demonstrate sufficient education, healthcare, sewage treatment, drainage, transport, and community infrastructure capacity to support the development contrary to Policy SP1, Policy DM12 and infrastructure-led growth principles within the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan.

### **5. Highway Safety and Cumulative Traffic Impact**

The proposal would result in unacceptable cumulative traffic and highway safety impacts on constrained rural roads and the wider A120 and A1124 corridors contrary to Policies DM1 and DM20 and paragraph 116 of the NPPF.

### **6. Ecological and Biodiversity Concerns**

The application fails adequately to assess and mitigate ecological impacts or demonstrate policy-compliant Biodiversity Net Gain contrary to Policy DM25, Policy ENV1, the Environment Act 2021 and biodiversity policy requirements.

### **7. Overdevelopment and Density**

The scale, density and form of development proposed are excessive and out of character with Great Tey, resulting in overdevelopment of the site contrary to Policies SP7 and DM10 and the Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan.

### **8. Residential Amenity Impacts**

The proposal would result in unacceptable impacts on neighbouring residential amenity, including overlooking, loss of privacy, noise, disturbance, and construction impacts contrary to Policies DM1, DM10 and DM23.

### **9. Prematurity and Lack of Master planning**

The proposal is premature and seeks to pre-empt the proper plan-led consideration of strategic growth, infrastructure planning, cumulative transport impacts, and settlement form through the emerging Local Plan process.

### **10. Insufficient Information and Outline Uncertainty**

The application is not supported by sufficient detail or technical evidence to enable the Local Planning Authority properly to assess the impacts of the proposal, including impacts relating to heritage, ecology, drainage, infrastructure, layout, and transport.

---

## **OVERARCHING STRATEGIC CONCERN**

The Parish Council considers that the proposal represents an attempt to urbanise Great Tey incrementally through speculative edge-of-village expansion without the strategic infrastructure, transport connectivity, healthcare capacity, education provision, environmental safeguards, or sustainability measures necessary to support growth appropriately.

The proposal therefore represents fundamentally unsustainable development.

---

## **OVERALL PLANNING BALANCE**

The proposal conflicts fundamentally with:

- The adopted Colchester Local Plan.
- The Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan.
- The National Planning Policy Framework.
- Sustainable development principles.

The harms identified are:

- Multiple.
- Significant.
- Cumulative.
- Long-term.
- Irreversible.

The proposal would result in:

- Harm to heritage assets and their settings.
- Loss of rural landscape character.
- Unsustainable transport impacts.
- Ecological uncertainty and biodiversity harm.
- Infrastructure pressure.
- Residential amenity impacts.
- Urbanisation of the village edge.

These harms are not outweighed by the limited public benefits of the proposal.

This is particularly the case where:

- There is no overriding housing need.
- The site is not allocated within the adopted Neighbourhood Plan.
- The development exceeds the scale contemplated even within the emerging Local Plan process.

---

## **CONCLUSION**

Taking all the above matters into account, Great Tey Parish Council concludes that Planning Application 260657 represents unsustainable and inappropriate development which would cause demonstrable harm to:

- The character of Great Tey.
- The rural landscape.

## *Great Tey Parish Council*

- Heritage assets.
- Ecology and biodiversity.
- Residential amenity.
- Local infrastructure.
- Highway safety.
- Sustainable transport objectives.

The proposal conflicts with multiple policies within:

- The Colchester Local Plan.
- The Great Tey Neighbourhood Plan.
- The National Planning Policy Framework.

Furthermore, serious concerns remain regarding:

- Deliverability of mitigation.
- Infrastructure capacity.
- Ecological protection.
- Long-term sustainability.
- Confidence in compliance with future conditions.

The Parish Council therefore respectfully but firmly requests that Planning Application 260657 be REFUSED.

Full and substantial weight should be given to the cumulative harms and policy conflicts identified within this objection.

---

### **FORMAL RESOLUTION**

Great Tey Parish Council formally resolves to OBJECT to Planning Application 260657 and requests that Colchester City Council refuse planning permission for the reasons set out within this representation.

---

Prepared on behalf of: GREAT TEY PARISH COUNCIL

14<sup>th</sup> May 2026

Kind Regards,  
Lynsey Ritchie-Fagg CiLCA  
Proper Officer & RFO